arXiv:1608.03136v1 [math.AP] 10 Aug 2016

Local Well-Posedness for the Derivative Nonlinear Schrödinger Equations with L^2 Subcritical Data

Shaoming Guo[†], **Xianfeng Ren**[‡] **and Baoxiang Wang**[‡,*]

[†] *Department of Mathematics, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47405, USA*

[‡] *LMAM, School of Mathematical Sciences, Peking University, Beijing 100871, PR of China*

Emails: shaoguo@iu.edu, xianfengren@pku.edu.cn, wbx@math.pku.edu.cn

August 11, 2016

Abstract

Considering the Cauchy problem of the derivative nonlinear Schrödinger equation (DNLS)

$$\mathrm{i}u_t + \partial_{xx}^2 u = \mathrm{i}\mu\partial_x(|u|^2 u), \quad u(0,x) = u_0(x), \tag{0.1}$$

we will show its local well-posedness in modulation spaces $M_{2,q}^{1/2}(\mathbb{R})$ $(2 \leqslant q < \infty)$. It is well-known that $H^{1/2}$ is a critical Sobolev space of DNLS so that it is locally well-posedness in H^s for $s \geqslant 1/2$ and ill-posed in $H^{s'}$ with $s' < 1/2$. Noticing that that $M_{2,q}^{1/2} \subset B_{2,q}^{1/q}$ is a sharp embedding and $L^2 \subset B_{2,\infty}^0$, our result contains all of the subcritical data in $M_{2,q}^{1/2}$, which contains a class of functions in $L^2 \setminus H^{1/2}$.

Keywords: Local well-posedness, Derivative nonlinear Schrödinger equations, Modulation spaces.

MSC 2010: 35Q55.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we consider the Cauchy problem for the derivative nonlinear Schrödinger equations with a derivative nonlinearity (DNLS)

$$\mathrm{i}u_t + \partial_{xx}^2 u = \mathrm{i}\mu\partial_x(|u|^2 u), \quad u(x,0) = u_0(x), \tag{1.1}$$

where u is a complex valued function of $(x,t) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0,T]$ for some $T > 0$, $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$.

Using the gauge transform

$$\mathcal{G}u(x) = \exp\left(-i\int_{-\infty}^{x} |u(y)|^2 dy\right) u(x) \tag{1.2}$$

*Corresponding author. The project was supported in part by NSFC, grant 10271023

Hayashi [17] obtained the global well-posedness of DNLS in H^1 (see also [18, 19, 29]). Takaoka [31] considered the rougher data and he established the local well-posedness in H^s with $s \geqslant 1/2$ by considering the equivalent equation of $v = \mathcal{G}u$:

$$\mathrm{i}v_t + \partial_{xx}^2 v = -\mathrm{i}\mu v^2 \partial_x \overline{v} - \frac{|\mu|^2}{2}|v|^4 v, \quad v(x,0) = v_0(x). \tag{1.3}$$

The ill-posedness in the sense that the solution map $u_0 \to u(t)$ in H^s with $s < 1/2$ is not uniformly continuous has been obtained by Biagioni and Linares [4]. So, $H^{1/2}$ is the critical Sobolev space in all H^s so that DNLS is well posed.

However, the critical space for DNLS in the scaling sense is L^2, i.e., for any solution u of DNLS, the scaling solution $u_\sigma(t,x) := \sigma^{1/2}u(\sigma^2 t,\ \sigma x)$ has an invariant norm in L^2 for any $\sigma > 0$. This fact implies that there is a gap between L^2 and $H^{1/2}$ for the well-posedness of DNLS. One can naturally ask what is the reasonable well-posed space with the regularity at the same level with L^2. In order to answer this question, Grünrock applied the $\widehat{H_p^s}$ spaces for which the norm is defined by

$$\|u\|_{\widehat{H_p^s}} := \|\langle\xi\rangle^s \widehat{u}\|_{p'}, \quad 1/p + 1/p' = 1$$

and he obtained that DNLS is local well-posed in $\widehat{H_p^{1/2}}$ for any $1 < p \leqslant 2$. Using the scaling argument we see that $\widehat{H_p^{1/2}}$ $(1 < p \leqslant 2)$ can be regarded as subcritical spaces. In this paper we consider the initial data in more general modulation spaces.

We write $\square_k = \mathscr{F}^{-1}\chi_{[k-1/2,k+1/2]}\mathscr{F}$, where $\mathscr{F}$ $(\mathscr{F}^{-1})$ denotes the (inverse) Fourier transform on $\mathbb{R}$, χ_E denotes the characteristic function on E. Modulation spaces $M_{p,q}^s$ were introduced by Feichtinger [11] and one can refer to [12] for their basic properties. The modulation space $M_{2,q}^s$ can be equivalently defined in the following way (cf. [38, 36, 35, 37]):

$$\|f\|_{M_{2,q}^s(\mathbb{R})} = \left(\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \langle k\rangle^{sq} \|\square_k f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^q\right)^{1/q}, \tag{1.4}$$

where $\langle k\rangle = (1+|k|^2)^{1/2}$. Let $2 \leqslant q \leqslant \infty$, $1/q + 1/q' = 1$. By Plancherel's inequality and Hölder's inequality, we see that $\widehat{H_{q'}^s} \subset M_{2,q}^s$. Combining the inclusions between Besov and modulation spaces, we have (cf. [30, 37])

$$\widehat{H_{q'}^{1/2}} \subset M_{2,q}^{1/2} \subset B_{2,q}^{1/q}$$

and these inclusions are optimal. On the other hand, from the scaling argument we see that for the scaling solution u_σ (cf. Sugimoto and Tomita [30], and Han and Wang [16]),

$$\|u_\sigma(t,\ \cdot)\|_{M_{2,q}^{1/2}} \lesssim \sigma^{1/q}\|u\|_{M_{2,q}^{1/2}}, \quad 0 < \sigma < 1, \quad q \geqslant 2.$$

Hence, $M_{2,q}^{1/2}$ $(2 \leqslant q < \infty)$ can be regarded as subcritical spaces and $M_{2,\infty}^{1/2}$ is a critical space for the DNLS.

Theorem 1.1 *Let $2 \leqslant q < \infty$, $u_0 \in M^{1/2}_{2,q}$. Then there exists a $T > 0$ such that DNLS (1.1) is locally well posed in $C([0,T]; M^{1/2}_{2,q}) \cap X^s_q([0,T])$, where X^s_q is defined in (2.1).*

The regularity index $1/2$ in $M^{1/2}_{2,q}$ is optimal. In fact, there is an ill-posedness for the DNLS in $M^s_{2,q}$ if $s < 1/2$; cf. [34]. We conject that DNLS is also ill-posed in $M^{1/2}_{2,\infty}$. Let us observe the following examples:

$$\widehat{u}_0(\xi) = \langle \xi \rangle^{-1/2-\eta}, \quad \widehat{v}_0(\xi) = \xi^{-1/2+\theta} \chi_{(0,1)}(\xi).$$

We see that $u_0 \in L^2$ if and only if $u_0 \in M^{1/2}_{2,q}$ for some $q > 2$, if and only if $\eta > 0$. $v_0 \in L^2$ if and only if $v_0 \in M^{1/2}_{2,q}$, if and only if $\theta > 0$. The above two examples indicate that the gaps between L^2 and $M^{1/2}_{2,q}$ $(q \gg 2)$ are very narrow.

There are some recent papers which have been devoted to the study of nonlinear PDE with initial data in modulation spaces $M^0_{p,1}$, see [1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 10, 21, 23, 24, 34, 39]. An interesting feature is that modulation spaces $M^0_{p,1}$ contains a class of initial data out of the critical Sobolev spaces H^{s_c}, for which the nonlinear PDE is well-posed for $s > s_c$ and ill-posed for $s < s_c$. Guo [15] considered a class of initial data in $M_{2,q}$ for the cubic NLS, where the case $q > 2$ was first taken into account by using U^p and V^p spaces.

Let $c < 1$, $C > 1$ denote positive universal constants, which can be different at different places, $a \lesssim b$ stands for $a \leqslant Cb$, $a \sim b$ means that $a \lesssim b$ and $b \lesssim a$. If $a = b + \ell$, $|\ell| \leqslant C$, then we write $a \approx b$. $a \gg b$ means that $a > b + C$. We write $a \wedge b = \min(a, b)$, $a \vee b = \max(a, b)$. We write p' as the dual number of $p \in [1, \infty]$, i.e., $1/p + 1/p' = 1$. We will use Lebesgue spaces $L^p := L^p(\mathbb{R})$, $\|\cdot\|_p := \|\cdot\|_{L^p}$, Sobolev spaces $H^s = (\mathrm{I} - \Delta)^{-s/2} L^2$. Some properties of these function spaces can be found in [3, 32].

2 U^p and V^p spaces

2.1 Definitions

U^p and V^p, as a development of Bourgain's spaces [5, 6] were first applied by Koch and Tataru in the study of NLS, cf. [26, 27, 28]. Using U^p and V^p, Hadac, Herr and Koch [20] obtained the well-posedness and scattering results for the critical KP-II equation. Let $\mathcal{Z}$ be the set of finite partitions $-\infty = t_0 < t_1 < ... < t_{K-1} < t_K = \infty$. Let $1 \leqslant p < \infty$. For any $\{t_k\}_{k=0}^K \subset \mathcal{Z}$ and $\{\phi_k\}_{k=0}^{K-1} \in L^2$ with $\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\phi_k\|_2^p = 1$, $\phi_0 = 0$. A step function $a : \mathbb{R} \to L^2$ given by

$$a = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \chi_{[t_{k-1}, t_k)} \phi_{k-1}$$

is said to be a U^p-atom. All of the U^p atoms is denoted by $\mathcal{A}(U^p)$. The U^p space is

$$U^p = \left\{ u = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} c_j a_j : \ a_j \in \mathcal{A}(U^p), \quad c_j \in \mathbb{C}, \quad \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |c_j| < \infty \right\}$$

for which the norm is given by

$$\|u\|_{U^p} = \inf\left\{\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}|c_j| : \quad u=\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} c_j a_j, \quad a_j \in \mathcal{A}(U^p), \quad c_j \in \mathbb{C}\right\}.$$

We define V^p as the normed space of all functions $v:\mathbb{R}\to L^2$ such that $\lim_{t\to\pm\infty} v(t)$ exist and for which the norm

$$\|v\|_{V^p} := \sup_{\{t_k\}_{k=0}^K\in\mathcal{Z}}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{K}\|v(t_k)-v(t_{k-1})\|_{L^2}^p\right)^{1/p}$$

is finite, where we use the convention that $v(-\infty)=\lim_{t\to\infty} v(t)$ and $v(\infty)=0$ (here $v(\infty)$ and $\lim_{t\to\infty} v(t)$ are different notations). Likewise, we denote by V_-^p the subspace of all $v\in V^p$ so that $v(-\infty)=0$. Moreover, we define the closed subspace V_{rc}^p ($V_{-,rc}^p$) as all of the right continuous functions in V^p (V_-^p).

We define

$$U_\Delta^p := e^{\cdot\,\mathrm{i}\Delta}U^p, \quad \|u\|_{U_\Delta^p} = \|e^{-\mathrm{i}t\Delta}u\|_{U^p}.$$
$$V_\Delta^p := e^{\cdot\,\mathrm{i}\Delta}V^p, \quad \|u\|_{V_\Delta^p} = \|e^{-\mathrm{i}t\Delta}u\|_{V^p}.$$

Similarly for the definition of $V_{rc,\Delta}^p$, $V_{-,\Delta}^p$, $V_{-,rc,\Delta}^p$.

We introduce the frequency-uniform localized U_Δ^2-spaces $X_q^s(I)$ and V_Δ^2-spaces $Y_q^s(I)$ for which the norms are defined by

$$\|u\|_{X_q^s(I)} = \left(\sum_{\lambda\in I\cap\mathbb{Z}}\langle\lambda\rangle^{sq}\|\Box_\lambda u\|_{U^2}^q\right)^{1/q}, \quad X_q^s := X_q^s(\mathbb{R}), \tag{2.1}$$

$$\|v\|_{Y_q^s(I)} = \left(\sum_{\lambda\in I\cap\mathbb{Z}}\langle\lambda\rangle^{sq}\|\Box_\lambda v\|_{V^2}^q\right)^{1/q}, \quad Y_q^s := X_q^s(\mathbb{R}), \tag{2.2}$$

$$\|u\|_{X_{q,\Delta}^s} := \|e^{-\mathrm{i}t\Delta}u\|_{X_q^s}, \quad \|v\|_{Y_{q,\Delta}^s} := \|e^{-\mathrm{i}t\Delta}v\|_{Y_q^s} \tag{2.3}$$

Besov type Bourgain's spaces $\dot{X}^{s,b,q}$ are defined by

$$\|u\|_{\dot{X}^{s,b,q}} := \left\|\|\chi_{|\tau-\xi^2|\in[2^{j-1},2^j)}|\xi|^s|\tau-\xi^2|^b\widehat{u}(\tau,\xi)\|_{L^2_{\xi,\tau}}\right\|_{\ell^q_{j\in\mathbb{Z}}}.$$

2.2 Known results on U^p and V^p

We list some known results in U^p and V^p (cf. [26, 28, 20]).

Proposition 2.1 (Embedding) *Let $1\leqslant p<q<\infty$. We have the following results.*

(i) *U^p and V^p, V_{rc}^p, V_-^p, $V_{rc,-}^p$ are Banach spaces.*

(ii) *$U^p\subset V_{rc,-}^p\subset U^q\subset L^\infty(\mathbb{R},L^2)$. Every $u\in U^p$ is right continuous on $t\in\mathbb{R}$*

(iii) $V^p \subset V^q$, $V_-^p \subset V_-^q$, $V_{rc}^p \subset V_{rc}^q$, $V_{rc,-}^p \subset V_{rc,-}^q$.

(iv) $\dot{X}^{0,1/2,1} \subset U_\Delta^2 \subset V_\Delta^2 \subset \dot{X}^{0,1/2,\infty}$.

It is known that, for the free solution of the Schrödinger equation $u(x,t) = e^{it\Delta}u_0$, $\widehat{u}(\xi,\tau)$ is supported on a curve $\tau + \xi^2 = 0$, which is said to be the *dispersion relation*. For the solution u of DNLS, $\widehat{u}(\xi,\tau)$ can be supported in $(\xi,\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, we need to consider the size of $|\xi^2 + \tau|$, which is said to be the *dispersion modulation*. By the last inclusion of (iv) in Proposition 2.1, we see that have

Lemma 2.2 (Dispersion Modulation Decay) *Suppose that the dispersion modulation $|\tau + \xi^2| \gtrsim \mu$ for a function $u \in L_{x,t}^2$, then we*

$$\|u\|_{L_{x,t}^2} \lesssim \mu^{-1/2}\|u\|_{V_\Delta^2}. \tag{2.4}$$

Proposition 2.3 (Interpolation) *Let $1 \leqslant p < q < \infty$. There exists a positive constant $\epsilon(p,q) > 0$, such that for any $u \in V^p$ and $M > 1$, there exists a decomposition $u = u_1 + u_2$ satisfying*

$$\frac{1}{M}\|u_1\|_{U^p} + e^{\epsilon M}\|u_2\|_{U^q} \lesssim \|u\|_{V^q}. \tag{2.5}$$

Proposition 2.4 (Duality) *Let $1 \leqslant p < \infty$, $1/p + 1/p' = 1$. Then $(U^p)^* = V^{p'}$ in the sense that*

$$T : V^{p'} \to (U^p)^*; \quad T(v) = B(\cdot, v), \tag{2.6}$$

is an isometric mapping. The bilinear form $B : U^p \times V^{p'}$ is defined in the following way: For a partition $\mathrm{t} := \{t_k\}_{k=0}^K \in \mathcal{Z}$, we define

$$B_{\mathrm{t}}(u,v) = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \langle u(t_{k-1}),\ v(t_k) - v(t_{k-1})\rangle. \tag{2.7}$$

Here $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ denotes the inner product on L^2. For any $u \in U^p$, $v \in V^{p'}$, there exists a unique number $B(u,v)$ satisfying the following property. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a partition t such that

$$|B(u,v) - B_{\mathrm{t}'}(u,v)| < \varepsilon, \quad \forall\ \mathrm{t}' \supset \mathrm{t}.$$

Moreover,

$$|B(u,v)| \leqslant \|u\|_{U^p}\|v\|_{V^{p'}}.$$

In particular, let $u \in V_-^1$ be absolutely continuous on compact interval, then for any $v \in V^{p'}$,

$$B(u,v) = \int \langle u'(t), v(t)\rangle dt.$$

2.3 Duality of X_q^s and $Y_{q'}^{-s}$

Proposition 2.5 (Duality) *Let $1 \leqslant q < \infty$. Then $(X_q^s)^* = Y_{q'}^{-s}$ in the sense that*

$$T : Y_{q'}^{-s} \to (X_q^s)^*; \quad T(v) = B(\cdot, v), \tag{2.8}$$

is an isometric mapping, where the bilinear form $B(\cdot,\cdot)$ is defined in Proposition 2.4. Moreover, we have

$$|B(u,v)| \leqslant \|u\|_{X_q^s} \|v\|_{Y_{q'}^{-s}}.$$

Proof. By the orthogonality, we see that

$$B_{\mathrm{t}}(\Box_k u, \Box_l v) = 0, \quad k \neq l,$$

which implies that

$$B(\Box_k u, \Box_l v) = 0, \quad k \neq l.$$

For any $v \in Y_{q'}^{-s}$, by Proposition 2.4 and Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |B(u,v)| &= \left| \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} B(\Box_k u, \Box_k v) \right| \\ &\leqslant \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \|\Box_k u\|_{U^2} \|\Box_k v\|_{V^2} \leqslant \|u\|_{X_q^s} \|v\|_{Y_{q'}^{-s}} \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $Y_{q'}^{-s} \subset (X_q^s)^*$ and $\|v\|_{(X_q^s)^*} \leqslant \|v\|_{Y_{q'}^{-s}}$.

Conversely, considering the map

$$X_q^s \ni f \to \{\Box_k f\} \in \ell_q^s(\mathbb{Z}; U^2),$$

where

$$\ell_q^s(\mathbb{Z}; U^2) := \left\{ \{f_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} : \quad \|\{f_k\}\|_{\ell_q^s(\mathbb{Z};U^2)} := \|\{\langle k\rangle^s \|f_k\|_{U^2}\}\|_{\ell^q} < \infty \right\},$$

we see that it is an isometric mapping from X_q^s into a subspace of $\ell_q^s(\mathbb{Z}; U^2)$. So, $v \in (X_q^s)^*$ can be regarded as a continuous functional in a subspace of $\ell_q^s(\mathbb{Z}; U^2)$. In view of Hahn-Banach Theorem, it can be extended onto $\ell_q^s(\mathbb{Z}; U^2)$ (the extension is written as $\tilde{v}$) and its norm will be preserved. In view of the well-known duality $(\ell_q^s(\mathbb{Z}; X))^* = \ell_{q'}^{-s}(\mathbb{Z}; X^*)$, we have

$$(\ell_q^s(\mathbb{Z}; U^2))^* = \ell_{q'}^{-s}(\mathbb{Z}; V^2),$$

and there exists $\{v_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \in \ell_{q'}^{-s}(\mathbb{Z}; V^2)$ such that

$$\langle \tilde{v}, \ \{f_k\}\rangle = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} B(f_k, v_k), \quad \forall\ \{f_k\} \in \ell_q^s(\mathbb{Z}; U^2).$$

Moreover, $\|v\|_{(X_q^s)^*} = \|\{v_k\}\|_{\ell_{q'}^{-s}(\mathbb{Z};V^2)}$. Hence, for any $u \in X_q^s$,

$$\langle v, u\rangle = \langle \tilde{v}, \{\Box_k u\}\rangle = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} B(\Box_k u, v_k).$$

From $B_{\rm t}(\Box_k u,\ v) = B_{\rm t}(u,\ \Box_k v)$ we see that $B(\Box_k u,\ v) = B(u,\ \Box_k v)$. It follows that

$$v = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \Box_k v_k.$$

Obviously, we have

$$\|v\|_{Y_{q'}^{-s}} \leqslant \|\{v_k\}\|_{\ell_{q'}^{-s}(\mathbb{Z};V^2)} = \|v\|_{(X_q^s)^*}.$$

This proves $(X_q^s)^* \subset Y_{q'}^{-s}$. □

Now we apply the duality to the norm calculation to the inhomogeneous part of the solution of DNLS in $X_{q,\Delta}^s$. It is known that (1.1) is equivalent to the following integral equation:

$$u(t) = e^{{\rm i}t\Delta}u_0 - \mathcal{A}\left({\rm i}\mu u^2\partial_x\overline{u} + \frac{|\mu|^2}{2}|u|^4u\right), \tag{2.9}$$

where

$$\mathcal{A}(f) = \int_0^t e^{{\rm i}(t-s)\Delta}f(s)ds.$$

By Propositions 2.4 and 2.5, we see that, for supp $v \subset \mathbb{R}\times[0,T]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathcal{A}(f)\|_{X_{p,\Delta}^{1/2}} &= \sup\left\{\left|B\left(\int_0^t e^{-{\rm i}s\Delta}f(s)ds, v\right)\right| :\ \|v\|_{Y_{p'}^{-1/2}} \leqslant 1\right\} \\
&\leqslant \sup_{\|v\|_{Y_{p'}^{-1/2}}\leqslant 1}\left|\int_{[0,T]}\langle f(s),\ e^{{\rm i}s\Delta}v(s)\rangle ds\right| \\
&\leqslant \sup_{\|v\|_{Y_{p',\Delta}^{-1/2}}\leqslant 1}\left|\int_{[0,T]}\langle f(s),\ v(s)\rangle ds\right|.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

3 Frequency localized estimates in L^4

Let $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ be an interval with finite length. For simply, we denote

$$u_\lambda = \Box_\lambda u,\quad u_I = \sum_{\lambda\in I\cap\mathbb{Z}} u_\lambda,$$

Lemma 3.1 ([15]) *Let $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ with $|I| < \infty$. For any $\theta \in (0,1)$, $\beta > 0$, we have*

$$\|u_I\|_{L^4_{x,t\in[0,T]}} \lesssim (T^{1/8} + T^{(1-\theta)/8}|I|^{\beta+(1-\theta)/4})\|u\|_{X^0_{4,\Delta}(I)}. \tag{3.1}$$

In particular, if $1 \lesssim |I| < \infty$, $0 < T < 1$, then for any $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$,

$$\|u_I\|_{L^4_{x,t\in[0,T]}} \lesssim T^{\varepsilon/3}|I|^{\varepsilon}\|u\|_{X^0_{4,\Delta}(I)}. \tag{3.2}$$

Lemma 3.2 *Let $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ with $1 \lesssim |I| < \infty$, $0 < T < 1$, then for any $4 \leqslant q < \infty$, $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$, we have*

$$\|u_I\|_{L^4_{x,t\in[0,T]}} \lesssim T^{\varepsilon/3}|I|^{1/4-1/q+\varepsilon} \max_{\lambda\in I}\langle\lambda\rangle^{-1/2}\|u\|_{X^{1/2}_{q,\Delta}(I)}, \tag{3.3}$$

$$\|u_I\|_{L^\infty_t L^2_x\cap V^2_\Delta} \lesssim |I|^{1/2-1/q} \max_{\lambda\in I}\langle\lambda\rangle^{-1/2}\|u\|_{X^{1/2}_{q,\Delta}(I)}, \tag{3.4}$$

$$\|u_I\|_{L^\infty_{x,t}} \lesssim |I|^{1-1/q} \max_{\lambda\in I}\langle\lambda\rangle^{-1/2}\|u\|_{X^{1/2}_{q,\Delta}(I)}. \tag{3.5}$$

Proof. By (3.2) and Hölder's inequality, we have (3.3). Using $M^0_{2,2} = L^2$, $V^2_\Delta \subset L^\infty_t L^2_x$ and Hölder's inequality, we have (3.4). In view of Bernstein's inequality,

$$\|u_I\|_{L^\infty_{x,t}} \lesssim |I|^{1/2}\|u_I\|_{L^\infty_t L^2_x}.$$

Combining it with (3.4), we have (3.5). □

Corollary 3.3 *Let $I_j = [a2^j, b2^j]$, $0 < a < b$, $0 < T < 1$, then for any $4 \leqslant q < \infty$, $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$, we have*

$$\|u_{I_j}\|_{L^4_{x,t\in[0,T]}} \lesssim T^{\varepsilon/3}2^{j(-1/4-1/q+\varepsilon)}\|u\|_{X^{1/2}_{q,\Delta}(I_j)}, \tag{3.6}$$

$$\|u_{I_j}\|_{L^\infty_t L^2_x\cap V^2_\Delta} \lesssim 2^{-j/q}\|u\|_{X^{1/2}_{q,\Delta}(I_j)}, \tag{3.7}$$

$$\|u_{I_j}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t}} \lesssim 2^{j(1/2-1/q)}\|u\|_{X^{1/2}_{q,\Delta}(I_j)}. \tag{3.8}$$

Corollary 3.4 *Let $\lambda_0 \gg 1$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$, $I_j = \lambda_0 - [a2^j, b2^j] \subset [c\lambda_0, \lambda_0]$ for some $0 < a < b$, $0 < T < 1$, then for any $4 \leqslant q < \infty$, $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$, we have*

$$\|u_{I_j}\|_{L^4_{x,t\in[0,T]}} \lesssim T^{\varepsilon/3}\langle\lambda_0\rangle^{-1/2}2^{j(1/4-1/q+\varepsilon)}\|u\|_{X^{1/2}_{q,\Delta}(I_j)}, \tag{3.9}$$

$$\|u_{I_j}\|_{L^\infty_t L^2_x} \lesssim \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{-1/2}2^{j(1/2-1/q)}\|u\|_{X^{1/2}_{q,\Delta}(I_j)}, \tag{3.10}$$

$$\|u_{I_j}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t}} \lesssim \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{-1/2}2^{j(1-1/q)}\|u\|_{X^{1/2}_{q,\Delta}(I_j)}. \tag{3.11}$$

Corollary 3.5 *Let $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\lambda_0 \gg 1$, $I \subset [c\lambda_0, \lambda_0]$ or $I \subset [-\lambda_0, -c\lambda_0]$ for some $c \in (0,1)$, $0 < T < 1$, then for any $4 \leqslant q < \infty$, $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$, we have*

$$\|u_I\|_{L^4_{x,t\in[0,T]}} \lesssim T^{\varepsilon/3}\langle\lambda_0\rangle^{-1/4-1/q+\varepsilon}\|u\|_{X^{1/2}_{q,\Delta}(I)}, \tag{3.12}$$

$$\|u_I\|_{L^\infty_t L^2_x\cap V^2_\Delta} \lesssim \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{-1/q}\|u\|_{X^{1/2}_{q,\Delta}(I)}, \tag{3.13}$$

$$\|u_I\|_{L^\infty_{x,t}} \lesssim \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2-1/q}\|u\|_{X^{1/2}_{q,\Delta}(I)}. \tag{3.14}$$

4 Bilinear Estimates

The following bilinear estimate can be found in [14], [15].

Lemma 4.1 (Bilinear Estimate 1) *Let $0 < T \leqslant 1$. Suppose that $\widehat{u}$, $\widehat{v}$ are localized in some compact intervals I_1, I_2 with $dist(I_1, I_2) \geqslant \lambda$. Then for any $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$, we have*

$$\|u\overline{v}\|_{L^2_{x,t\in[0,T]}} \lesssim T^{\varepsilon/4}\lambda^{-1/2+\varepsilon}\|u\|_{V^2_\Delta}\|v\|_{V^2_\Delta}. \tag{4.1}$$

Similar to Grünrock's bilinear estimate, we can consider the following bilinear estimate, which is useful for our late purpose.

Lemma 4.2 (Bilinear Estimate 2) *Let $0 < T \leqslant 1$. Suppose that $\widehat{u}, \widehat{v}$ are localized in some compact intervals I_1, I_2 with $dist(I_1, I_2) \geqslant \lambda$. Then for any $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$, we have*

$$\|uv\|_{L^2_{x,t\in[0,T]}} \lesssim T^{\varepsilon/4}\lambda^{-1/2+\varepsilon}\|u\|_{V^2_\Delta}\|v\|_{V^2_\Delta}. \tag{4.2}$$

Proof. First, we show that if $\widehat{u}_0, \widehat{v}_0$ are localized in I_1, I_2 with $dist(I_1, I_2) \geqslant \lambda$, then

$$\left\|e^{it\Delta}u_0 e^{it\Delta}v_0\right\|_{L^2_{x,t\in\mathbb{R}}} \lesssim \lambda^{-1/2}\|u_0\|_2\|v_0\|_2. \tag{4.3}$$

We have

$$\mathscr{F}_x\left(e^{it\Delta}u_0 e^{it\Delta}v_0\right) = \int e^{-it(\xi^2-2\xi\xi_1+2\xi_1^2)}\widehat{u}_0(\xi-\xi_1)\widehat{v}_0(\xi_1)d\xi_1. \tag{4.4}$$

It follows that

$$\mathscr{F}_{x,t}\left(e^{it\Delta}u_0 e^{it\Delta}v_0\right) = \int \delta(2\xi_1^2 - 2\xi\xi_1 + \xi^2 + \tau)\widehat{u}_0(\xi-\xi_1)\widehat{v}_0(\xi_1)d\xi_1. \tag{4.5}$$

Denote

$$g(\xi_1) = 2\xi_1^2 - 2\xi\xi_1 + \xi^2 + \tau,$$

we see that

$$g'(\xi_1) = 4\xi_1 - 2\xi, \quad g(\xi_1^\pm) = 0, \quad \xi^\pm = \frac{\xi}{2} \pm \sqrt{\frac{\xi^2}{4} - \frac{\xi^2+\tau}{2}} := \frac{\xi}{2} \pm y.$$

Recall that $\delta(g(\xi_1)) = \delta(\xi_1 - \xi^+)/|g'(\xi^+)| - \delta(\xi_1 - \xi^-)/|g'(\xi^-)| = \delta(\xi_1 - \xi^+)/4y - \delta(\xi_1 - \xi^-)/4y$, we have

$$\mathscr{F}_{x,t}\left(e^{it\Delta}u_0 e^{it\Delta}v_0\right) = \frac{1}{4y}\widehat{u}_0\left(\frac{\xi}{2}-y\right)\widehat{v}_0\left(\frac{\xi}{2}+y\right) - \frac{1}{4y}\widehat{u}_0\left(\frac{\xi}{2}+y\right)\widehat{v}_0\left(\frac{\xi}{2}-y\right). \tag{4.6}$$

By symmetry, it suffices to estimate the first term in (4.6). Changing of variables $y = \sqrt{\frac{\xi^2}{4} - \frac{\xi^2+\tau}{2}}$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|e^{it\Delta}u_0 e^{it\Delta}v_0\right\|^2_{L^2_{x,t}} &\leqslant \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{c}{|y|}\left|\widehat{u}_0\left(\frac{\xi}{2}-y\right)\right|^2\left|\widehat{v}_0\left(\frac{\xi}{2}+y\right)\right|^2 dyd\xi \\
&\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{1}{|\xi_1-\xi_2|}|\widehat{u}_0(\xi_1)|^2|\widehat{v}_0(\xi_2)|^2 d\xi_1 d\xi_2 \\
&\lesssim \lambda^{-1}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\widehat{u}_0(\xi_1)|^2|\widehat{v}_0(\xi_2)|^2 d\xi_1 d\xi_2 = C\lambda^{-1}\|u_0\|_2^2\|v_0\|_2^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

where in the last inequality, we have applied $dist(I_1, I_2) > \lambda$. By testing atoms in U^2, then applying the interpolation in Proposition 2.3, we have the Bilinear Estimate 2. $\square$

5 Trilinear estimates

We need to have a bound of the second term of the integral equation (2.9) in $X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}$. More precisely, we want to show that

$$\left\| \int_0^t e^{(t-s)\Delta}(u^2\partial_x \bar{u})(s)\, ds \right\|_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}} \lesssim T^{\varepsilon}\|u\|^3_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}, \tag{5.1}$$

$$\left\| \int_0^t e^{(t-s)\Delta}(uv\partial_x \bar{w})(s)\, ds \right\|_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}} \lesssim T^{\varepsilon}\|u\|_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}\|v\|_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}\|w\|_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}. \tag{5.2}$$

Proof of (5.1)**.** In view of (2.10), it suffices to show that

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}\times[0,T]} vu^2\partial_x \overline{u} dxdt \right| \lesssim T^{\varepsilon}\|u\|^3_{X^{\frac{1}{2}}_{2,p}}\|v\|_{Y^{-1/2}_{p'}}. \tag{5.3}$$

We perform a uniform decomposition with u, v in the left hand side of (5.3), it suffice to prove that

$$\left| \sum_{\lambda_0,\dots,\lambda_3} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} \int_{[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}} \overline{v}_{\lambda_0} u_{\lambda_1} u_{\lambda_2} \partial_x \overline{u}_{\lambda_3}\, dxdt \right| \lesssim T^{\varepsilon}\|u\|^3_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}\|v\|_{Y^0_{p',\Delta}}. \tag{5.4}$$

In order to keep the left hand side of (5.4) nonzero, we have the frequency constraint condition (FCC)

$$\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 - \lambda_3 - \lambda_0 \approx 0 \tag{5.5}$$

and dispersion modulation constraint condition (DMCC)

$$\max_{0\leqslant k\leqslant 3} |\xi_k^2 + \tau_k| \gtrsim |(\xi_0 - \xi_1)(\xi_0 - \xi_2)|, \tag{5.6}$$

where we assume that $\widehat{v}_{\lambda_0}, \widehat{u}_{\lambda_1}, ..., \widehat{u}_{\lambda_3}$ in (5.4) are functions of $(\xi_0, \tau_0), ..., (\xi_3, \tau_3)$, respectively. It suffices to consider the cases that λ_0 is minimal or secondly minimal number in $\lambda_0, ..., \lambda_3$ (In the opposite case, one can instead $\lambda_0, ..., \lambda_3$ by $-\lambda_0, ..., -\lambda_3$).

Step 1. We assume that $\lambda_0 = \min_{0\leqslant k\leqslant 3}\lambda_k$. We separate the proof into two subcase $\lambda_0 \geqslant 0$ and $\lambda_0 < 0$.

Step 1.1. We consider the case $\lambda_0 \geqslant 0$. Let us denote $I_0 = [0, 1)$, $I_j = [2^{j-1}, 2^j)$, $j \geqslant 1$. We decompose $\lambda_0 + [0, \infty)$ by dyadic decomposition, i.e.,

$$\lambda_k \in \lambda_0 + [0, \infty) = \bigcup_{j_k\geqslant 0} (\lambda_0 + I_{j_k}), \quad k = 1, 2, 3.$$

Recall that

$$u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_k}} = \sum_{\lambda_k\in\lambda_0+I_{j_k}} u_{\lambda_k}, \quad k = 1, 2, 3.$$

By the symmetry we can assume that $j_1 \leqslant j_2$. Moreover, in view of FCC (5.5), we see that $j_2 \approx j_3$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathscr{L}^+(u,v) &:= \sum_{0\leqslant\lambda_0\leqslant\lambda_k,\ k=1,2,3} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} \int_{[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}} \overline{v}_{\lambda_0} u_{\lambda_1} u_{\lambda_2} \partial_x \overline{u}_{\lambda_3}\, dxdt \\
&= \sum_{\lambda_0\geqslant 0,\ j_1\leqslant j_2,\ j_3\approx j_2} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} \int_{[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}} \overline{v}_{\lambda_0} u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}} u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_2}} \partial_x \overline{u}_{\lambda_0+I_{j_3}}\, dxdt \\
&\leqslant \left(\sum_{\lambda_0\geqslant 0,\ j_1\leqslant j_2\approx j_3\lesssim 1} + \sum_{\lambda_0\geqslant 0,\ j_1\leqslant 10,\ j_2\approx j_3\gg 1} + \sum_{\lambda_0\geqslant 0,\ 10<j_1\leqslant j_2\approx j_3} \right) \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} \\
&\quad \times \int_{[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}} |\overline{v}_{\lambda_0} u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}} u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_2}} \partial_x \overline{u}_{\lambda_0+I_{j_3}}|\, dxdt \\
&:= \mathscr{L}^+_l(u,v) + \mathscr{L}^+_m(u,v) + \mathscr{L}^+_h(u,v). \qquad (5.7)
\end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that in $\mathscr{L}^+_l(u,v)$, the frequency of $u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_k}}$ $(k=1,2,3)$ are all localized in a neighbourhood of λ_0. So, by Hölder's inequality, $\|\Box_k u\|_4 \leqslant \|\Box_k u\|_2$ and $U^2_\Delta \subset V^2_\Delta \subset L^\infty_t L^2_x$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathscr{L}^+_l(u,v)| &\lesssim \sum_{\lambda_0\approx\lambda_1\approx\lambda_2\approx\lambda_3} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{3/2} \|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{L^4_t L^4_x} \|u_{\lambda_1}\|_{L^4_t L^4_x} \|u_{\lambda_2}\|_{L^4_t L^4_x} \|u_{\lambda_3}\|_{L^4_t L^4_x} \\
&\lesssim T\|u\|^3_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}} \|v\|_{Y^0_{p',\Delta}}. \qquad (5.8)
\end{aligned}$$

In $\mathscr{L}^+_m(u,v)$, we easily see that the frequency of v_{λ_0} and $u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}}$ are localized near λ_0, which are much less than those of $u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_2}}$ and $u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_3}}$. So, we can use bilinear estimate (4.1) and Lemma 3.2 to obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathscr{L}^+_m(u,v)| &\lesssim \sum_{\lambda_0\geqslant 0,\ j_1\leqslant 10,\ j_2\approx j_3\gg 1} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} \|u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}} \partial_x \overline{u}_{\lambda_0+I_{j_3}}\|_{L^2_{x,t}} \|\overline{v}_{\lambda_0} u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_2}}\|_{L^2_{x,t}} \\
&\lesssim T^{\varepsilon/2} \sum_{\lambda_0\geqslant 0,\ j_1\leqslant 10,\ j_2\approx j_3\gg 1} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} \langle\lambda_0+2^{j_3}\rangle 2^{(-1/2+\varepsilon)j_3} \|u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}}\|_{V^2_\Delta} \|u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_3}}\|_{V^2_\Delta} \\
&\quad \times 2^{(-1/2+\varepsilon)j_2} \|u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_2}}\|_{V^2_\Delta} \|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V^2_\Delta} \\
&\lesssim T^{\varepsilon/2} \sum_{\lambda_0\geqslant 0, j\gg 1, |\ell_1|\vee|\ell_2|\lesssim 1} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} \langle\lambda_0+2^j\rangle 2^{(-1+2\varepsilon)j} \|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V^2_\Delta} \|u_{\lambda_0+\ell_1}\|_{V^2_\Delta} \|u_{\lambda_0+I_{j+\ell_2}}\|_{V^2_\Delta} \|u_{\lambda_0+I_j}\|_{V^2_\Delta} \\
&\lesssim T^{\varepsilon/2} \sum_{\lambda_0\geqslant 0,\ j\gg 1, |\ell|\lesssim 1} 2^{(-2/p+2\varepsilon)j} \|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V^2_\Delta} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} \|u_{\lambda_0+\ell}\|_{V^2_\Delta} \|u\|^2_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}. \qquad (5.9)
\end{aligned}$$

Noticing that $0<\varepsilon<1/p$, we have from Hölder's inequality that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathscr{L}^+_m(u,v)| &\lesssim T^{\varepsilon/2} \|u\|^2_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}} \sum_{\lambda_0\geqslant 0,\ |\ell|\lesssim 1} \|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V^2_\Delta} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} \|u_{\lambda_0+\ell}\|_{V^2_\Delta} \\
&\lesssim T^{\varepsilon/2} \|u\|^3_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}} \|v\|_{X^0_{p',\Delta}}. \qquad (5.10)
\end{aligned}$$

Now we estimate $\mathscr{L}^+_h(u,v)$.

Case 1. v_{λ_0} has the highest dispersion modulation in the right hand side of $\mathscr{L}_h^+(u,v)$ in (5.7). In view of DMCC (5.6), we have

$$|\xi_0^2+\tau_0| \gtrsim 2^{j_1+j_2}.$$

It follows from the dispersion modulation decay (2.4) that

$$\|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{L^2_{x,t}} \lesssim 2^{-(j_1+j_2)/2}\|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V^2_\Delta}. \tag{5.11}$$

By Hölder's inequality, we have

$$|\mathscr{L}_h^+(u,v)| \leqslant \sum_{\lambda_0\geqslant 0,\ 10<j_1\leqslant j_2\approx j_3} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2}\|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{L^2_tL^\infty_x}\|u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}}\|_{L^\infty_tL^2_x}\|u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_2}}\|_{L^4_{x,t\in[0,T]}}\|u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_3}}\|_{L^4_{x,t\in[0,T]}}.$$

Using $\|v_\lambda\|_\infty \lesssim \|v_\lambda\|_2$, the bound of the highest modulation in (5.11) and Lemma 3.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathscr{L}_h^+(u,v)| &\lesssim T^{\varepsilon/2}\sum_{\lambda_0\geqslant 0,\ 10<j_1\leqslant j_2\approx j_3} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2}2^{-(j_1+j_2)/2}\|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V^2_\Delta}\langle\lambda_0+2^{j_3}\rangle\\ &\quad\times 2^{j_1(1/2-1/p)+j_2(1/4-1/p+\varepsilon)+j_3(1/4-1/p+\varepsilon)}\prod_{k=1}^3\langle\lambda_0+2^{j_k}\rangle^{-1/2}\|u\|_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}(\lambda_0+I_{j_k})}.\end{aligned}$$

Making the summation on j_2, j_3, applying Hölder's inequality on λ_0 and finally summing over all j_1, we have for $0<\varepsilon<1/2p$,

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathscr{L}_h^+(u,v)| &\lesssim T^{\varepsilon/2}\sum_{\lambda_0\geqslant 0,\ j_1>10} 2^{j_1(-3/p+2\varepsilon)}\|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V^2_\Delta}\|u\|_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}(\lambda_0+I_{j_1})}\|u\|^2_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}.\\ &\lesssim T^{\varepsilon/2}\|u\|^3_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}\|v\|_{X^0_{p',\Delta}}.\end{aligned} \tag{5.12}$$

Case 2. $u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}}$ has the highest dispersion modulation in the right hand side of $\mathscr{L}_h^+(u,v)$ in (5.7). In order to use DMCC (5.6), $u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}}$ takes $L^2_{x,t}$ norm, $u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_2}}$ and $u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_3}}$ take $L^4_{x,t}$ norms. Indeed, we have

$$|\mathscr{L}_h^+(u,v)| \leqslant \sum_{\lambda_0\geqslant 0,\ 10<j_1\leqslant j_2\approx j_3} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2}\|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t}}\|u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}}\|_{L^2_{x,t}}\|u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_2}}\|_{L^4_{x,t\in[0,T]}}\|u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_3}}\|_{L^4_{x,t\in[0,T]}}.$$

Using the fact $\|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t}} \lesssim \|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{L^\infty_tL^2_x} \lesssim \|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V^2_\Delta}$, the dispersion modulation decay estimate (5.11) and Lemma 3.2, this case reduces to the same estimate as in Case 1, see (5.12).

Case 3. $u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_2}}$ has the highest dispersion modulation in the right hand side of $\mathscr{L}_h^+(u,v)$ in (5.7). If $j_1 \approx j_3$ in the right hand side of $\mathscr{L}_h^+(u,v)$ in (5.7), then we can repeat the proof as in Case 2 to obtain the desired estimates. So, it suffuces to consider the case $j_1 \ll j_3$. $j_1 \ll j_3$ implies that the frequency of $u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_3}}$ is much higher than that of $u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}}$ and we can use the bilinear estimate (4.2). By Hölder's inequality,

$$|\mathscr{L}_h^+(u,v)| \leqslant \sum_{\lambda_0\geqslant 0,\ 10<j_1\ll j_2\approx j_3} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2}\|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t}}\|u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}}\partial_x\overline{u}_{\lambda_0+I_{j_3}}\|_{L^2_{x,t}}\|u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_2}}\|_{L^2_{x,t\in[0,T]}}.$$

Applying the bilinear estimate (4.1), DMCC (5.6) and Lemma 3.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathscr{L}_h^+(u,v)| &\leqslant \sum_{\lambda_0\geqslant 0,\ 10<j_1\ll j_2\approx j_3} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2}\|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V_\Delta^2}T^{\varepsilon/4}2^{j_3(-1/2+\varepsilon)}\|u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}}\|_{V_\Delta^2}\|u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_3}}\|_{V_\Delta^2}\\ &\quad\times\langle\lambda_0+2^{j_3}\rangle 2^{-(j_1+j_2)/2}\|u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_2}}\|_{V_\Delta^2}\\ &\leqslant T^{\varepsilon/4}\sum_{\lambda_0\geqslant 0,\ 10<j_1\ll j_2\approx j_3} 2^{-(j_1+j_2+j_3)/p+\varepsilon j_3}\|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V_\Delta^2}\|u\|_{X_{p,\Delta}^{1/2}(\lambda_0+I_{j_1})}\|u\|^2_{X_{p,\Delta}^{1/2}}\end{aligned}$$

Making the summation on j_2, j_3, we have

$$|\mathscr{L}_h^+(u,v)|\leqslant T^{\varepsilon/4}\sum_{\lambda_0\geqslant 0,\ j_1>10} 2^{j_1(-3/p+\varepsilon)}\|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V_\Delta^2}\|u\|_{X_{p,\Delta}^{1/2}(\lambda_0+I_{j_1})}\|u\|^2_{X_{p,\Delta}^{1/2}}.$$

This reduces to the same estimate as in the first inequality of (5.12).

Case 4. $u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_3}}$ has the highest modulation in the right hand side of $\mathscr{L}_h^+(u,v)$ in (5.7). Noticing that $j_2\approx j_3$ in $\mathscr{L}_h^+(u,v)$, using the bilinear estimate(4.2) instead of (4.1) we see that this case is similar to Case 3.

Step 1.2. We consider the case $\lambda_0<0$. We can assume that $\lambda_0\ll 0$. For short, we denote by $\lambda\in h_-$ and $\lambda\in l_-$ the fact $\lambda\in[\lambda_0,3\lambda_0/4)$ and $\lambda\in[3\lambda_0/4,0)$, respectively. We need to consider the following three cases $\lambda_1\in h_-$, $\lambda_1\in l_-$ and $\lambda_1\in[0,\infty)$ separately.

Case A. $\lambda_1\in h_-$. We consider the following four subcases as in Table 1.

Case	$\lambda_1\in$	$\lambda_2\in$	$\lambda_3\in$
h_h_a	$[\lambda_0,3\lambda_0/4)$	$[\lambda_0,3\lambda_0/4)$	$[\lambda_0,\infty)$
$h_l_l_$	$[\lambda_0,3\lambda_0/4)$	$[3\lambda_0/4,\ 0)$	$[\lambda_0,0)$
$h_l_a_+$	$[\lambda_0,3\lambda_0/4)$	$[3\lambda_0/4,0)$	$[0,\infty)$
h_a_+a	$[\lambda_0,3\lambda_0/4)$	$[0,\infty)$	$[\lambda_0,\infty)$

Table 1: In $\lambda_1,...,\lambda_3$, there is at least one frequency near λ_0

Case h_h_a. By FCC (5.5), we see that $\lambda_3\in[\lambda_0,\lambda_0/2+C)$. Hence, λ_3 is also near λ_0. Using the same way as in the proof of Step 1, we can get the result and the details are omitted.

Case $h_l_l_$. By FCC (5.5), we see that $\lambda_3\geqslant 3\lambda_0/4-C$. We decompose λ_k in the following way:

$$\lambda_1\in\lambda_0+[0,-\frac{\lambda_0}{4})=\bigcup_{j_1\geqslant 0}(\lambda_0+I_{j_1});^1\ \lambda_2\in[\frac{3\lambda_0}{4},0)=\bigcup_{j_2\geqslant 0}-I_{j_2};\ \ \lambda_3\in[\frac{3\lambda_0}{4}-C,0)=\bigcup_{j_3\geqslant 0}-I_{j_3}.$$

Again, in view of (5.5) we see that

$$(j_1\vee j_3)\ \approx j_2.$$

[1]In order to realize the identity, we can assume that $I_{j_1}=[2^{j-1},2^j)\cap[0,-\lambda_0/4)$, it is convenient to use such a kind of notations below.

We have the following three subcases:

$$j_1 \ll j_3,\ j_2 \approx j_3;\quad or\quad j_3 \ll j_1,\ j_1 \approx j_2;\quad or\quad j_1 \approx j_2 \approx j_3$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} \int_{[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}} |\overline{v}_{\lambda_0} u_{[\lambda_0,\ 3\lambda_0/4)} u_{[3\lambda_0/4,\ 0)} \partial_x \overline{u}_{[3\lambda_0/4-C,\ 0)}|\, dxdt \\
&\leqslant \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ (j_1\vee j_3)\approx j_2\lesssim \ln\langle\lambda_0\rangle} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} \int_{[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}} |\overline{v}_{\lambda_0} u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}} u_{-I_{j_2}} \partial_x \overline{u}_{-I_{j_3}}|\, dxdt
\end{aligned}$$

We consider the case $j_1 \ll j_3,\ j_2 \approx j_3$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathscr{L}^{-}_{h_l_l_}(u,v) &:= \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ j_1\ll j_2\approx j_3\lesssim \ln\langle\lambda_0\rangle} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} \int_{[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}} |\overline{v}_{\lambda_0} u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}} u_{-I_{j_2}} \partial_x \overline{u}_{-I_{j_3}}|\, dxdt \\
&\leqslant \left(\sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ j_1\leqslant 10\ll j_2\approx j_3\lesssim \ln\langle\lambda_0\rangle} + \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ 10<j_1\ll j_2\approx j_3\lesssim \ln\langle\lambda_0\rangle} \right) \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} \\
&\quad \times \int_{[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}} |\overline{v}_{\lambda_0} u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}} u_{-I_{j_2}} \partial_x \overline{u}_{-I_{j_3}}|\, dxdt \\
&:= \mathscr{L}^{-,m}_{h_l_l_}(u,v) + \mathscr{L}^{-,h}_{h_l_l_}(u,v). \qquad (5.13)
\end{aligned}$$

In order to estimate $\mathscr{L}^{-,m}_{h_l_l_}(u,v)$, we follow the same ideas as in (5.9). We may assume that $2^{10} \leqslant -\lambda_0/16$. It follows that $\lambda_0 + 2^{j_1} + 2^{j_2} \leqslant \lambda_0/16$. Now we can use the bilinear estimate (4.1), Corollary 3.3. For $0 < \varepsilon < 1/2p$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathscr{L}^{-,m}_{h_l_l_}(u,v) &\lesssim \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ j_1\leqslant 10\ll j_2\approx j_3\lesssim \ln\langle\lambda_0\rangle} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} \|\overline{v}_{\lambda_0} \partial_x \overline{u}_{-I_{j_3}}\|_{L^2_{x,t\in[0,T]}} \|u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}} u_{-I_{j_2}}\|_{L^2_{x,t\in[0,T]}} \\
&\lesssim T^{\varepsilon/2} \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ |\ell|,|\ell_1|\lesssim 1,\ 1\ll j\lesssim \ln\langle\lambda_0\rangle} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{-1/2+2\varepsilon} 2^{j} \|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V^2_\Delta} \|u_{-I_j}\|_{V^2_\Delta} \|u_{\lambda_0+\ell}\|_{V^2_\Delta} \|u_{-I_{j+\ell_1}}\|_{V^2_\Delta} \\
&\lesssim T^{\varepsilon/2} \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ |\ell|\lesssim 1,\ 1\ll j\lesssim \ln\langle\lambda_0\rangle} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{-1/2+2\varepsilon} 2^{j-2j/p} \|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V^2_\Delta} \|u_{\lambda_0+\ell}\|_{V^2_\Delta} \|u\|^2_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}} \\
&\lesssim T^{\varepsilon/2} \|v\|_{Y^0_{p',\Delta}} \|u\|^3_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}. \qquad (5.14)
\end{aligned}$$

For the estimate of $\mathscr{L}^{-,h}_{h_l_l_}(u,v)$, we need to us DMCC (5.6), we have

$$\max_{0\leqslant k\leqslant 3} |\xi_k^2 + \tau_k| \gtrsim |(\xi_0-\xi_1)(\xi_0-\xi_2)| \gtrsim 2^{j_1} \langle\lambda_0\rangle. \qquad (5.15)$$

If v_{λ_0} has the highest dispersion modulation, we have

$$\mathscr{L}^{-,h}_{h_l_l_}(u,v) \lesssim \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ 10<j_1\ll j_2\approx j_3\lesssim \ln\langle\lambda_0\rangle} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} 2^{j_3} \|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{L^2_t L^\infty_x} \|u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}}\|_{L^\infty_t L^2_x} \|u_{-I_{j_2}}\|_{L^4_{x,t}} \|u_{-I_{j_3}}\|_{L^4_{x,t}}. \qquad (5.16)$$

In view of (2.4), Corrollary 3.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{L}^{-,h}_{h_l_l_}(u,v) &\lesssim T^{2\varepsilon/3}\sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ 10<j_1\ll j_2\approx j_3\lesssim \ln\langle\lambda_0\rangle}\langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2}2^{j_3}2^{-j_1/2}\langle\lambda_0\rangle^{-1/2}\|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V^2_\Delta}\\ &\quad\times\langle\lambda_0\rangle^{-1/2}2^{j_1(1/2-1/p)}\|u\|_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}(\lambda_0+I_{j_1})}2^{(j_2+j_3)(-1/4-1/p+\varepsilon)}\|u\|^2_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}\\ &\lesssim T^{2\varepsilon/3}\sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ 10<j_1\ll j_3\lesssim \ln\langle\lambda_0\rangle}2^{-j_1/p}2^{j_3/2+(-2/p+2\varepsilon)j_3}\langle\lambda_0\rangle^{-1/2}\|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V^2_\Delta}\\ &\quad\times\|u\|_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}(\lambda_0+I_{j_1})}\|u\|^2_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}.\end{aligned}\tag{5.17}$$

Making the summation on j_3, then using the same way as in (5.12), one has that for $0<\varepsilon<1/2p$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{L}^{-,h}_{h_l_l_}(u,v) &\lesssim T^{2\varepsilon/3}\sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ 10<j_1}2^{(-3/p+2\varepsilon)j_1}\|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V^2_\Delta}\|u\|_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}(\lambda_0+I_{j_1})}\|u\|^2_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}.\\ &\lesssim T^{\varepsilon/2}\|u\|^3_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}\|v\|_{Y_{p',\Delta}}.\end{aligned}\tag{5.18}$$

If $u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}}$ has the highest dispersion modulation, we have

$$\mathscr{L}^{-,h}_{h_l_l_}(u,v)\lesssim\sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ 10<j_1\ll j_2\approx j_3\lesssim\ln\langle\lambda_0\rangle}\langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2}2^{j_3}\|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t}}\|u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}}\|_{L^2_{x,t}}\|u_{-I_{j_2}}\|_{L^4_{x,t}}\|u_{-I_{j_3}}\|_{L^4_{x,t}}.\tag{5.19}$$

Applying the dispersion modulation decay estimate (2.4) to $u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}}$, and $\|v_{\lambda_0}\|_\infty\lesssim\|v_{\lambda_0}\|_2$, we can reduce the estimate of (5.19) to the case as in (5.17) and (5.18), the details are omitted.

Now we consider the case that $u_{-I_{j_2}}$ has the highest modulation. In $\mathscr{L}^{-,h}_{h_l_l_}(u,v)$, it is easy to see that $j_1\ll\ln\langle\lambda_0\rangle$, which implies that $\lambda_0+2^{j_1}+2^{j_3}\leqslant\lambda_0/16$. Using the bilinear estimate (4.1) to $\partial_x\overline{u}_{-I_{j_3}}u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}}$, and the dispersion modulation decay estimate (2.4), one has that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{L}^{-,h}_{h_l_l_}(u,v) &\lesssim\sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ 10<j_1\ll j_2\approx j_3\lesssim\ln\langle\lambda_0\rangle}\langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2}\|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t}}\|u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}}\partial_x\overline{u}_{-I_{j_3}}\|_{L^2_{x,t}}\|u_{-I_{j_2}}\|_{L^2_{x,t}}\\ &\lesssim\sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ 10<j_1\ll j_2\approx j_3\lesssim\ln\langle\lambda_0\rangle}\langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2}\|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V^2_\Delta}T^{\varepsilon/4}\langle\lambda_0\rangle^{-1/2+\varepsilon}\|u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}}\|_{V^2_\Delta}\|\partial_x u_{-I_{j_3}}\|_{V^2_\Delta}\\ &\quad\times 2^{-j_1/2}\langle\lambda_0\rangle^{-1/2}\|u_{-I_{j_2}}\|_{V^2_\Delta}\end{aligned}\tag{5.20}$$

It follows from Lemma 3.2 and (5.20) that

$$\mathscr{L}^{-,h}_{h_l_l_}(u,v)\lesssim T^{\varepsilon/4}\sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ j_1\leqslant j_3\lesssim\ln\langle\lambda_0\rangle}\|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V^2_\Delta}\langle\lambda_0\rangle^{-1+\varepsilon}2^{-j_1/p}2^{j_3(1-2/p)}\|u\|_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}(\lambda_0+I_{j_1})}\|u\|^2_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}.\tag{5.21}$$

Making the summation on j_3 and using the same way as in (5.12), we have for $0<\varepsilon<1/2p$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{L}^{-,h}_{h_l_l_}(u,v)&\lesssim T^{\varepsilon/4}\sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ j_1}\|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V^2_\Delta}2^{-2j_1/p}\|u\|_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}(\lambda_0+I_{j_1})}\|u\|^2_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}\\&\lesssim T^{\varepsilon/2}\|u\|^3_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}\|v\|_{Y_{p',\Delta}}.\end{aligned}\tag{5.22}$$

We consider the case $j_3\ll j_1\approx j_2$. We denote

$$\mathscr{H}^{-}_{h_l_l_}(u,v):=\sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ j_3\ll j_1\approx j_2\lesssim\ln\langle\lambda_0\rangle}\langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2}\int_{[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}}|\overline{v}_{\lambda_0}u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}}u_{-I_{j_2}}\partial_x\overline{u}_{-I_{j_3}}|\,dxdt\tag{5.23}$$

In $\mathscr{H}^{-,h}_{h_l_l_}(u,v)$, observing DMCC (5.6), we have

$$\max_{0\leqslant k\leqslant 3}|\xi_k^2+\tau_k|\gtrsim|(\xi_0-\xi_1)(\xi_0-\xi_2)|\gtrsim 2^{j_1}\langle\lambda_0\rangle.\tag{5.24}$$

In view of (5.24) we see that the lower bound of the highest dispersion modulation is the same as that of the case $j_1\ll j_3\approx j_2$. Moreover, $\partial_x u_{-I_{j_3}}$ has the lower frequency, which leads to that the derivative in front of $u_{-I_{j_3}}$ becomes easier to handle. So, we omit the details of the proof in this case.

For the case $j_1\approx j_2\approx j_3$, we divide the proof into two subcases: $j_3\lesssim 1$ and $j_3\gg 1$. The first case is very easy, since both $u_{-I_{j_2}}$ and $u_{-I_{j_3}}$ have the low frequency in a neighbourhood of 0. One can directly use Hölder's inequality to get the desired estimate. For the case $j_3\gg 1$, we consider that the highest dispersion modulation (larger than $2^{j_1}\langle\lambda_0\rangle$) is due to v_{λ_0}, $u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}}$, $u_{-I_{j_2}}$ and $u_{-I_{j_3}}$, separately. Denote

$$\mathscr{J}^{-,h}_{h_l_l_}(u,v)\lesssim\sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ 1\ll j_1\approx j_2\approx j_3\lesssim\ln\langle\lambda_0\rangle}\langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2}\int_{[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}}|\overline{v}_{\lambda_0}u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}}u_{-I_{j_2}}\partial_x\overline{u}_{-I_{j_3}}|\,dxdt.$$

If v_{λ_0} has the highest dispersion modulation, we have

$$\mathscr{J}^{-,h}_{h_l_l_}(u,v)\lesssim\sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ 1\ll j_1\approx j_2\approx j_3\lesssim\ln\langle\lambda_0\rangle}\langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2}2^{j_3}\|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{L^2_tL^\infty_x}\|u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}}\|_{L^\infty_tL^2_x}\|u_{-I_{j_2}}\|_{L^4_{x,t}}\|u_{-I_{j_3}}\|_{L^4_{x,t}}.$$

We can follow the same way as in dealing with (5.16) to have the desired estimate. If $u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}}$ has the highest dispersion modulation, we have

$$\mathscr{J}^{-,h}_{h_l_l_}(u,v)\lesssim\sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ 1\ll j_1\approx j_2\approx j_3\lesssim\ln\langle\lambda_0\rangle}\langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2}2^{j_3}\|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t}}\|u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}}\|_{L^2_{x,t}}\|u_{-I_{j_2}}\|_{L^4_{x,t}}\|u_{-I_{j_3}}\|_{L^4_{x,t}}.$$

If $u_{-I_{j_2}}$ has the highest dispersion modulation, we have

$$\mathscr{J}^{-,h}_{h_l_l_}(u,v)\lesssim\sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ 1\ll j_1\approx j_2\approx j_3\lesssim\ln\langle\lambda_0\rangle}\langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2}2^{j_3}\|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t}}\|u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}}\|_{L^4_{x,t}}\|u_{-I_{j_2}}\|_{L^2_{x,t}}\|u_{-I_{j_3}}\|_{L^4_{x,t}}.$$

Then, using (2.4), Lemma 3.2 and similar estimates as in the above, we can get the the result, as desired.

Case $h_l_a_+$. By FCC (5.5), we see that $\lambda_3 < -\lambda_0/4 + C$. We decompose λ_k:

$$\lambda_1 \in \lambda_0+[0,-\frac{\lambda_0}{4}) = \bigcup_{j_1\geqslant 0}(\lambda_0+I_{j_1});\ \lambda_2 \in [\frac{3\lambda_0}{4},0) = \bigcup_{j_2\geqslant 0} -I_{j_2};\ \ \lambda_3 \in [0,\ -\frac{\lambda_0}{4}+C) = \bigcup_{j_3\geqslant 0} I_{j_3}.$$

Again, in view of FCC (5.5) we see that

$$(j_2 \vee j_3)\ \approx j_1,\quad j_1 \leqslant \ln\langle\lambda_0\rangle + C.$$

It follows that

$$j_2 \ll j_3 \approx j_1;\quad or\quad j_3 \ll j_2 \approx j_1;\quad or\quad j_1 \approx j_2 \approx j_3.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0}\langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2}\int_{[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}}|\overline{v}_{\lambda_0}u_{[\lambda_0,\ 3\lambda_0/4)}u_{[3\lambda_0/4,\ 0)}\partial_x\overline{u}_{[0,-\lambda_0/4+C)}|\,dxdt\\ &\leqslant \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ (j_2\vee j_3)\approx j_1\lesssim\ln\langle\lambda_0\rangle}\langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2}\int_{[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}}|\overline{v}_{\lambda_0}u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}}u_{-I_{j_2}}\partial_x\overline{u}_{I_{j_3}}|\,dxdt\end{aligned}$$

From the proof of the Case $h_l_l_$, it suffices to consider the case $j_2 \ll j_3 \approx j_1$. We estimate

$$\mathscr{L}^-_{h_l_l}(u,v) := \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ j_2\ll j_3\approx j_1\lesssim\ln\langle\lambda_0\rangle}\langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2}\int_{[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}}|\overline{v}_{\lambda_0}u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}}u_{-I_{j_2}}\partial_x\overline{u}_{I_{j_3}}|\,dxdt. \quad (5.25)$$

In the right hand side of $\mathscr{L}^-_{h_l_l}(u,v)$, by DMCC (5.6),

$$\max_{0\leqslant k\leqslant 3}|\xi_k^2+\tau_k| \gtrsim 2^{j_1}\langle\lambda_0\rangle. \quad (5.26)$$

If v_{λ_0} has the highest dispersion modulation, in a similar way as in (5.16)–(5.18), we have for $0<\varepsilon<1/2p$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{L}^-_{h_l_l}(u,v) &\lesssim \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ j_2\ll j_3\approx j_1\lesssim\ln\langle\lambda_0\rangle}\langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2}2^{j_3}\|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{L^2_tL^\infty_x}\|u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}}\|_{L^4_{x,t}}\|u_{-I_{j_2}}\|_{L^\infty_tL^2_x}\|u_{I_{j_3}}\|_{L^4_{x,t}}\\ &\lesssim T^{2\varepsilon/3}\sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ j_1\lesssim\ln\langle\lambda_0\rangle}2^{(-2/p+2\varepsilon)j_1}\|v_{\lambda_0}\|^2_{V^2_\Delta}\|u\|_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}(\lambda_0+I_{j_1})}\|u\|^2_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}\\ &\lesssim T^{\varepsilon/2}\|u\|^3_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}\|v\|_{Y_{p',\Delta}}. \end{aligned}\quad (5.27)$$

Now we consider the case that $u_{-I_{j_2}}$ has the highest dispersion modulation.

$$\mathscr{L}^-_{h_l_l}(u,v) \lesssim \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ j_2\ll j_3\approx j_1\lesssim\ln\langle\lambda_0\rangle}\langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2}2^{j_3}\|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t}}\|u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}}\|_{L^4_{x,t}}\|u_{-I_{j_2}}\|_{L^2_{x,t}}\|u_{I_{j_3}}\|_{L^4_{x,t}}. \quad (5.28)$$

Applying the dispersion modulation decay estimate (2.4) to $u_{-I_{j_2}}$, we can reduce the estimate of (5.28) to the case as in (5.27), the details are omitted.

Assume that $u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}}$ has the highest dispersion modulation. Using the bilinear estimate (4.1) to $u_{-I_{j_2}}\partial_x\overline{u}_{I_{j_3}}$, and the dispersion modulation decay estimate (2.4), then applying Lemma 3.2, one has that for $0<\varepsilon<1/2p$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{L}^-_{h-l-l}(u,v)&\lesssim \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ j_2\ll j_3\approx j_1\lesssim\ln\langle\lambda_0\rangle}\langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2}\|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t}}\|u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}}\|_{L^2_{x,t}}\|u_{-I_{j_2}}\partial_x\overline{u}_{I_{j_3}}\|_{L^2_{x,t}}\\&\lesssim T^{\varepsilon/4}\sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ j_1\lesssim\ln\langle\lambda_0\rangle}\|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V^2_\Delta}2^{j_1(-2/p+\varepsilon)}\|u\|_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}(\lambda_0+I_{j_1})}\|u\|^2_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}\\&\lesssim T^{\varepsilon/4}\|u\|^3_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}\|v\|_{Y_{p',\Delta}}.\end{aligned}\tag{5.29}$$

If $u_{I_{j_3}}$ has the highest dispersion modulation, we can use the same way as in the case that $u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}}$ has the highest dispersion modulation to obtain the result. The details are omitted.

Case h_-a_+a. First, using FCC (5.5), we have $\lambda_3\geqslant -C$. Moreover, if $\lambda_3\leqslant C$, we see that $\lambda_2\leqslant C$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0}\langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2}\left|\int_{[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}}\overline{v}_{\lambda_0}u_{[\lambda_0,\ 3\lambda_0/4)}u_{[0,\ \infty)}\partial_x\overline{u}_{[\lambda_0,\infty)}\,dxdt\right|\\&\leqslant\sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0}\langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2}\left|\int_{[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}}\overline{v}_{\lambda_0}u_{[\lambda_0,\ 3\lambda_0/4)}u_{[0,\ C)}\partial_x\overline{u}_{[-C,C)}\,dxdt\right|\\&\quad+\sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0}\langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2}\left|\int_{[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}}\overline{v}_{\lambda_0}u_{[\lambda_0,\ 3\lambda_0/4)}u_{[0,\ \infty)}\partial_x\overline{u}_{[C,\ \infty)}\,dxdt\right|\\&:=L^-_{h-a_+l}(u,v)+L^-_{h-a_+h}(u,v).\end{aligned}\tag{5.30}$$

In $L^-_{h-a_+l}(u,v)$, there are two lower frequency in a neighbourhood of the origin and two higher frequency near λ_0. Hence, we can use the bilinear estimate (4.1) to obtain that

$$\mathscr{L}^-_{h-a_+l}(u,v)\lesssim T^{\varepsilon/2}\|u\|^3_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}\|v\|_{Y_{p',\Delta}}.\tag{5.31}$$

We estimate $L^-_{h-a_+h}(u,v)$. Considering the dyadic version of λ_k:

$$\lambda_1\in\lambda_0+[0,-\frac{\lambda_0}{4})=\bigcup_{j_1\geqslant 0}(\lambda_0+I_{j_1});\ \lambda_2\in[0,\infty)=\bigcup_{j_2\geqslant 0}I_{j_2};\ \ \lambda_3\in[C,\ \infty)=\bigcup_{j_3\gtrsim 1}I_{j_3}.$$

Again, in view of FCC (5.5) we see that

$$(j_1\vee j_2)\ \approx j_3,\ \ j_1\leqslant\ln\langle\lambda_0\rangle+C.$$

We have the following three subcases:

$$j_1\ll j_2\approx j_3;\ \ \textit{or}\ \ j_2\ll j_1\approx j_3;\ \ \textit{or}\ \ j_1\approx j_2\approx j_3.$$

Using the dyadic version, we have

$$\mathscr{L}^{-}_{h-a+h}(u,v) := \left(\sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ j_1\ll j_2\approx j_3} + \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ j_2\ll j_1\approx j_3} + \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ j_1\approx j_2\approx j_3} \right) \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} \\ \times \int_{[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}} |\overline{v}_{\lambda_0} u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}} u_{I_{j_2}} \partial_x \overline{u}_{I_{j_3}}|\, dxdt := I + II + III. \tag{5.32}$$

We mainly estimate I. Using the bilinear estimate (4.2), Corollary 3.3, Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_l &:= \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ j_1\leqslant 10\ll j_2\approx j_3} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} \int_{[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}} |\overline{v}_{\lambda_0} u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}} u_{I_{j_2}} \partial_x \overline{u}_{I_{j_3}}|\, dxdt \\ &\leqslant \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ j_1\leqslant 10\ll j_2\approx j_3} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} \|\overline{v}_{\lambda_0}\partial_x \overline{u}_{I_{j_3}}\|_{L^2_{x,t}} \|u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}} u_{I_{j_2}}\|_{L^2_{x,t}} \\ &\leqslant T^{\varepsilon/2} \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ j_1\leqslant 10\ll j_2\approx j_3} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} (\langle\lambda_0\rangle + 2^{j_2})^{-1+2\varepsilon} 2^{j_2} \|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V^2_\Delta} \|u_{I_{j_3}}\|_{V^2_\Delta} \|u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}}\|_{V^2_\Delta} \|u_{I_{j_2}}\|_{V^2_\Delta} \\ &\leqslant T^{\varepsilon/2} \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0, |\ell|\lesssim 1, j_2\gg 1} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} 2^{j_2(-2/p+2\varepsilon)} \|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V^2_\Delta} \|u_{\lambda_0+\ell}\|_{V^2_\Delta} \|u\|^2_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}} \\ &\lesssim T^{\varepsilon/2} \|u\|^3_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}} \|v\|_{Y_{p',\Delta}}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.33}$$

We estimate

$$I_h := \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ 10\leqslant j_1\ll j_2\approx j_3} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} \int_{[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}} |\overline{v}_{\lambda_0} u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}} u_{I_{j_2}} \partial_x \overline{u}_{I_{j_3}}|\, dxdt. \tag{5.34}$$

In the right hand side of I_h, in view of DMCC (5.6), the highest dispersion modulation

$$\max_{0\leqslant k\leqslant 3} |\xi_k^2 + \tau_k| \gtrsim 2^{j_1}(\langle\lambda_0\rangle + 2^{j_2}). \tag{5.35}$$

If v_{λ_0} has the highest dispersion modulation, in a similar way as in (5.16)–(5.18), we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_h &\lesssim \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ 10< j_1\ll j_2\approx j_3} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} 2^{j_3} \|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{L^2_t L^\infty_x} \|u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}}\|_{L^\infty_t L^2_x} \|u_{I_{j_2}}\|_{L^4_{x,t}} \|u_{I_{j_3}}\|_{L^4_{x,t}} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ 10< j_1\ll j_2\approx j_3} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} 2^{j_3} 2^{-j_1/2} (\langle\lambda_0\rangle + 2^{j_2})^{-1/2} \|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V^2_\Delta} \|u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}}\|_{V^2_\Delta} \|u_{I_{j_2}}\|_{L^4_{x,t}} \|u_{I_{j_3}}\|_{L^4_{x,t}} \\ &\lesssim T^{2\varepsilon/3} \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ 10< j_1\ll j_2} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} 2^{-j_1/2} (\langle\lambda_0\rangle + 2^{j_2})^{-1/2} \|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V^2_\Delta} \\ &\qquad \times \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{-1/2} 2^{j_1(1/2-1/p)} \|u\|_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}(\lambda_0+I_{j_1})} 2^{j_2(-1/2-2/p+2\varepsilon)} 2^{j_2} \|u\|^2_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.36}$$

Summing over all j_2, then using Hölder's on λ_0, we obtain that for $0 < \varepsilon < 1/2p$,

$$I_h \lesssim T^{\varepsilon/2} \|u\|^3_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}} \|v\|_{Y_{p',\Delta}}. \tag{5.37}$$

If $u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}}$ has the highest dispersion modulation, in a similar way as in (5.36) and (5.37), we have for $0<\varepsilon<1/2p$,

$$\begin{aligned} I_h &\lesssim \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ 10<j_1\ll j_2\approx j_3} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} 2^{j_3} \|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t}} \|u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}}\|_{L^2_{x,t}} \|u_{I_{j_2}}\|_{L^4_{x,t}} \|u_{I_{j_3}}\|_{L^4_{x,t}} \\ &\lesssim T^{\varepsilon/2} \|u\|^3_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}} \|v\|_{Y_{p',\Delta}}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.38}$$

If $u_{I_{j_3}}$ has the highest dispersion modulation, we have

$$I_h \lesssim \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ 10<j_1\ll j_2\approx j_3} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} 2^{j_3} \|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t}} \|u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}} u_{I_{j_2}}\|_{L^2_{x,t}} \|u_{I_{j_3}}\|_{L^2_{x,t}}. \tag{5.39}$$

Using the bilinear estimate (4.2), and the dispersion modulation decay (5.35) and (2.4), then applying Lemma 3.2,

$$\begin{aligned} I_h &\lesssim T^{\varepsilon/4} \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ j_1>10} 2^{(-3/p+\varepsilon)j_1} \|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V^2_\Delta} \|u\|_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}(\lambda_0+I_{j_1})} \|u\|^2_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}} \\ &\lesssim T^{\varepsilon/4} \|u\|^3_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}} \|v\|_{Y_{p',\Delta}}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.40}$$

If $u_{I_{j_2}}$ has the highest dispersion modulation, we have

$$I_h \lesssim \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ 10<j_1\ll j_2\approx j_3} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} \|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t}} \|u_{I_{j_2}}\|_{L^2_{x,t}} \|u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}} \partial_x \overline{u}_{I_{j_3}}\|_{L^2_{x,t}}. \tag{5.41}$$

One sees that $dist(\lambda_0+I_{j_1},\ I_{j_3}) \gtrsim \langle\lambda_0\rangle + 2^{j_3}$. Using the bilinear estimate (4.1) and the dispersion modulation decay (2.4) and (5.35),

$$\begin{aligned} I_h &\lesssim T^{\varepsilon/4} \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ 10<j_1\ll j_2\approx j_3} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} \|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V^2_\Delta} 2^{-j_1/2} (\langle\lambda_0\rangle + 2^{j_2})^{-1+\varepsilon} \|u_{I_{j_2}}\|_{V^2_\Delta} \\ &\quad \times 2^{j_3} \|u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}}\|_{V^2_\Delta} \|u_{I_{j_3}}\|_{V^2_\Delta}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.42}$$

Applying Corollaries 3.3, 3.4 and making the summations in turn to j_3 and j_2, λ_0, j_1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_h &\lesssim T^{\varepsilon/4} \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ j_2\geqslant j_1>10} 2^{j_2(-2/p+\varepsilon)} 2^{-j_1/p} \|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V^2_\Delta} \|u\|_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}(\lambda_0+I_{j_1})} \|u\|^2_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}} \\ &\lesssim T^{\varepsilon/4} \|u\|^3_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}} \|v\|_{Y_{p',\Delta}}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.43}$$

Case B. $\lambda_1 \in l_-$. Since λ_1 and λ_2 are symmetry, it suffices to consider the following four subcases as in Table 2.

Case l_-l_-l. From FCC (5.5) it follows that $\lambda_3 \geqslant \lambda_0/2 - C$. Moreover, we see that $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 < \lambda_0/8$. So, it suffices to estimate

$$\mathscr{L}^-_{l_-l_-l}(u,v) := \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} \left| \int_{[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}} \overline{v}_{\lambda_0} u_{[3\lambda_0/4,\lambda_0/8)} u_{[3\lambda_0/4,\lambda_0/8)} \partial_x \overline{u}_{[\lambda_0/2-C,-\lambda_0/16)}\, dxdt \right|. \tag{5.44}$$

Case	$\lambda_1 \in$	$\lambda_2 \in$	$\lambda_3 \in$
l_l_l	$[3\lambda_0/4, 0)$	$[3\lambda_0/4, 0)$	$[\lambda_0, -\lambda_0/16)$
$l_l_h_+$	$[3\lambda_0/4, 0)$	$[3\lambda_0/4,\ 0)$	$[-\lambda_0/16, \infty)$
$l_a_+a_m$	$[3\lambda_0/4, 0)$	$[0, \infty)$	$[\lambda_0, -\lambda_0)$
$l_a_+h_+$	$[3\lambda_0/4, 0)$	$[0, \infty)$	$[-\lambda_0, \infty)$

Table 2: $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3$ far away from λ_0.

Using the dyadic decomposition and Corollary 3.3, we see that

$$\|\partial_x \overline{u}_{[\lambda_0/2-C,0)}\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2 \cap V_\Delta^2} \leqslant \sum_{j \leqslant \ln\langle\lambda_0\rangle} \|\partial_x u_{I_j}\|_{V_\Delta^2} \leqslant \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1-1/p} \|u\|_{X_{p,\Delta}^{1/2}}; \tag{5.45}$$

$$\|\partial_x \overline{u}_{[\lambda_0/2-C,0)}\|_{L_{x,t}^4} \leqslant T^{\varepsilon/3} \sum_{j \leqslant \ln\langle\lambda_0\rangle} \|\partial_x u_{I_j}\|_{L_{x,t}^4} \leqslant \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{3/4-1/p+\varepsilon} \|u\|_{X_{p,\Delta}^{1/2}}. \tag{5.46}$$

Similarly, $\partial_x \overline{u}_{[0,-\lambda_0/16)}$ has the same estimates as in (5.45) and (5.46). By DMCC (5.6), the highest dispersion modulation satisfies

$$\bigvee_{k=0}^{3} |\xi_k^2 + \tau_k| \gtrsim \langle\lambda_0\rangle^2. \tag{5.47}$$

If v_{λ_0} has the highest dispersion modulation, we have

$$\mathscr{L}^-_{l_l_l}(u,v) \leqslant \sum_{\lambda_0 \ll 0} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} \|\overline{v}_{\lambda_0}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^\infty} \|u_{[3\lambda_0/4,\lambda_0/8)}\|_{L_{x,t}^4}^2 \|\partial_x \overline{u}_{[\lambda_0/2-C,-\lambda_0/16)}\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}. \tag{5.48}$$

Applying the highest dispersion modulation decay estimate (2.4), Corollary 3.5, (5.45) and (5.46), we have

$$\mathscr{L}^-_{l_l_l}(u,v) \leqslant T^{\varepsilon/2} \sum_{\lambda_0 \ll 0} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{-3/p+2\varepsilon} \|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V_\Delta^2} \|u\|_{X_{p,\Delta}^{1/2}}^3 \lesssim T^{\varepsilon/2} \|v\|_{Y_{p',\Delta}^0} \|u\|_{X_{p,\Delta}^{1/2}}^3. \tag{5.49}$$

If $u_{[\lambda_0/2-C,-\lambda_0/16)}$ gains the highest dispersion modulation, we can use an analogous way to get the result. In fact, taking $L_{x,t}^\infty$, $L_{x,t}^4$ and $L_{x,t}^2$ norms for v_{λ_0}, $u_{[3\lambda_0/4,\lambda_0/8)}$ and $\partial_x u_{[\lambda_0/2-C,-\lambda_0/16)}$, respectively, then using the dispersion modulation decay estimate (2.4), Corollary 3.5, (5.45), we also have (5.49). Finally, in the case $u_{[3\lambda_0/4,\lambda_0/8)}$ having the highest dispersion modulation, taking $L_{x,t}^\infty$, $L_{x,t}^2$, $L_{x,t}^4$ and $L_{x,t}^4$ norms for v_{λ_0}, $u_{[3\lambda_0/4,\lambda_0/8)}$, $u_{[3\lambda_0/4,\lambda_0/8)}$ and $\partial_x u_{[\lambda_0/2-C,-\lambda_0/16)}$, respectively, then using the dispersion modulation decay estimate (2.4), Corollary 3.5, (5.45) and (5.48), we also have (5.49).

Case $l_l_h_+$. We easily see that $\lambda_3 \leqslant -\lambda_0 + C$. We collect λ_k in the following dyadic version:

$$\lambda_k \in [3\lambda_0/4, 0) = \bigcup_{j_k} -I_{j_k},\ \ k = 1, 2;\ \ \lambda_3 \in [-\lambda_0/16, -\lambda_0 + C) = \bigcup_{j_3 \geqslant -1} (-\lambda_0 - I_{j_3}),\ \ j_{-1} = [0, C).$$

By FCC (5.5), we see that $j_3 \approx (j_1 \vee j_2) \lesssim \ln\langle\lambda_0\rangle$. We need to estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathscr{L}^{-}_{l_l_h_+}(u,v) &:= \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} \left| \int_{[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}} \overline{v}_{\lambda_0} u_{[3\lambda_0/4,0)} u_{[3\lambda_0/4,0)} \partial_x \overline{u}_{[-\lambda_0/16,-\lambda_0+C)}\, dxdt \right| \\
&\lesssim \left(\sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ j_1\ll j_2\approx j_3} + \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ j_2\ll j_1\approx j_3} + \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ j_1\approx j_2\approx j_3} \right) \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} \\
&\qquad\qquad \times \int_{[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}} |\overline{v}_{\lambda_0} u_{-I_{j_1}} u_{-I_{j_2}} \partial_x \overline{u}_{-\lambda_0-I_{j_3}}|\, dxdt \\
&:= \sum_{i=1,2,3} \mathscr{L}^{-,i}_{l_l_h_+}(u,v). \qquad (5.50)
\end{aligned}$$

In the right hand side of (5.50), from DMCC (5.6) it follows that

$$\max_{0\leqslant k\leqslant 3} |\xi_k^2 + \tau_k| \gtrsim \langle\lambda_0\rangle^2. \qquad (5.51)$$

If v_{λ_0} attains the highest dispersion modulation, using a similar way as in (5.16)–(5.18), we have for $0 < \varepsilon < 1/2p$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathscr{L}^{-,1}_{l_l_h_+}(u,v) &\lesssim \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ j_1\ll j_2\approx j_3} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} \|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{L^2_t L^\infty_x} \|u_{-I_{j_1}}\|_{L^\infty_t L^2_x} \|u_{-I_{j_2}}\|_{L^4_{x,t}} \|\partial_x u_{-\lambda_0-I_{j_3}}\|_{L^4_{x,t}} \\
&\lesssim \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ j_1\ll j_2\approx j_3} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{-1/2} \|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V^2_\Delta} \|u_{-I_{j_1}}\|_{V^2_\Delta} \|u_{-I_{j_2}}\|_{L^4_{x,t}} \|\partial_x u_{-\lambda_0-I_{j_3}}\|_{L^4_{x,t}} \\
&\lesssim T^{2\varepsilon/3} \sum_{j_1\ll j_3,\ \lambda_0\ll 0} 2^{-j_1/p} 2^{(-2/p+2\varepsilon)j_3} \|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V^2_\Delta} \|u\|_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}(-\lambda_0-I_{j_3})} \|u\|^2_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}} \\
&\lesssim T^{2\varepsilon/3} \sum_{j_3,\ \lambda_0\ll 0} 2^{(-2/p+2\varepsilon)j_3} \|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V^2_\Delta} \|u\|_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}(-\lambda_0-I_{j_3})} \|u\|^2_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}} \\
&\lesssim T^{\varepsilon/2} \|u\|^3_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}} \|v\|_{Y_{p',\Delta}}. \qquad (5.52)
\end{aligned}$$

In the case $u_{-I_{j_1}}$ attaining the highest dispersion modulation, we have from (2.4) and (5.51) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathscr{L}^{-,1}_{l_l_h_+}(u,v) &\lesssim \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ j_1\ll j_2\approx j_3} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} \|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t}} \|u_{-I_{j_1}}\|_{L^2_{x,t}} \|u_{-I_{j_2}}\|_{L^4_{x,t}} \|\partial_x u_{-\lambda_0-I_{j_3}}\|_{L^4_{x,t}} \\
&\lesssim \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ j_1\ll j_2\approx j_3} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{-1/2} \|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V^2_\Delta} \|u_{-I_{j_1}}\|_{V^2_\Delta} \|u_{-I_{j_2}}\|_{L^4_{x,t}} \|\partial_x u_{-\lambda_0-I_{j_3}}\|_{L^4_{x,t}}, \qquad (5.53)
\end{aligned}$$

which is the same as in the right hand side of the second inequality as in (5.52).

If $u_{-I_{j_2}}$ has the highest modulation, we have

$$\mathscr{L}^{-,1}_{l_l_h_+}(u,v) \lesssim \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ j_1\ll j_2\approx j_3} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} \|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t}} \|u_{-I_{j_2}}\|_{L^2_{x,t}} \|u_{-I_{j_1}} \partial_x \overline{u}_{-\lambda_0-I_{j_3}}\|_{L^2_{x,t}}. \qquad (5.54)$$

Noticing that for any $\lambda_1 \in -I_{j_1},\ \lambda_3 \in -\lambda_0 - I_{j_3}$, if $j_1 \ll j_3$, we have $|\lambda_3| - |\lambda_1| \gtrsim |\lambda_0|$. Using (5.15), the bilinear estimate (4.1), Corollaries 3.3 and 3.4, and noticing that $j_3 \lesssim \ln\langle\lambda_0\rangle$, we have

$$\mathscr{L}^{-,1}_{l_-l_-h_+}(u,v) \lesssim T^{\varepsilon/4} \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ j_1\ll j_3} 2^{-j_1/p} 2^{j_3(-2/p+\varepsilon)} \|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V^2_\Delta} \|u\|_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}(-\lambda_0 - I_{j_3})} \|u\|^2_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}. \tag{5.55}$$

$\mathscr{L}^{-,2}_{l_-l_-h_+}(u,v)$ and $\mathscr{L}^{-,3}_{l_-l_-h_+}(u,v)$ can be estimated in an analogous way as above, we omit the details.

Case $l_-a_+a_m$. In view of the frequency constraint condition we see that $\lambda_2 \in [0, -3\lambda_0/4 + C)$ and $\lambda_3 \in [-\lambda_0/4 - C, -\lambda_0)$. We consider the dyadic collections of λ_k:

$$\lambda_1 \in [\frac{3\lambda_0}{4}, 0) = \bigcup_{j_1} -I_{j_1},\ \ \lambda_2 \in [0, -\frac{3\lambda_0}{4} + C) = \bigcup_{j_2} I_{j_2},\ \ \lambda_3 \in [-\frac{\lambda_0}{4} - C, -\lambda_0) = \bigcup_{j_3 \geqslant 0} (-\lambda_0 - I_{j_3}).$$

It is easy to see that $j_1 \approx (j_2 \vee j_3) \lesssim \ln\langle\lambda_0\rangle$. We need to estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathscr{L}^{-}_{l_-a_+h_m}(u,v) &:= \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} \left| \int_{[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}} \overline{v}_{\lambda_0} u_{[3\lambda_0/4,0)} u_{[0,-3\lambda_0/4+C)} \partial_x \overline{u}_{[-\lambda_0/4-C,-\lambda_0)}\, dxdt \right| \\
&\lesssim \left(\sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ j_3\ll j_2\approx j_1} + \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ j_2\ll j_1\approx j_3} + \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ j_1\approx j_2\approx j_3} \right) \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} \\
&\qquad \times \int_{[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}} |\overline{v}_{\lambda_0} u_{-I_{j_1}} u_{I_{j_2}} \partial_x \overline{u}_{-\lambda_0 - I_{j_3}}|\, dxdt.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.56}$$

Using a similar way as in the estimate of (5.50), we can get the desired result and we omit the details.

Case $l_-a_+h_+$. We consider the dyadic collections of λ_k:

$$\lambda_1 \in [\frac{3\lambda_0}{4}, 0) = \bigcup_{j_1} -I_{j_1},\quad \lambda_2 \in [0, \infty) = \bigcup_{j_2 \geqslant 0} I_{j_2},\quad \lambda_3 \in [-\lambda_0, \infty) = \bigcup_{j_3 \geqslant 0} (-\lambda_0 + I_{j_3}).$$

From FCC (5.5) it follows that $j_2 \approx (j_1 \vee j_3)$. We need to estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathscr{L}^{-}_{l_-a_+h_+}(u,v) &:= \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} \left| \int_{[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}} \overline{v}_{\lambda_0} u_{[3\lambda_0/4,0)} u_{[0,\infty)} \partial_x \overline{u}_{[-\lambda_0,\infty)}\, dxdt \right| \\
&\lesssim \left(\sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ j_1\ll j_2\approx j_3} + \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ j_3\ll j_1\approx j_2} + \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ j_1\approx j_2\approx j_3} \right) \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} \\
&\qquad \times \int_{[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}} |\overline{v}_{\lambda_0} u_{-I_{j_1}} u_{I_{j_2}} \partial_x \overline{u}_{-\lambda_0 + I_{j_3}}|\, dxdt := \Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2 + \Gamma_3.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.57}$$

In the right hand side of (5.57), by DMCC (5.6) the highest dispersion modulation satisfies

$$\max_{0\leqslant k\leqslant 3} |\xi_k^2 + \tau_k| \gtrsim \langle\lambda_0\rangle(\langle\lambda_0\rangle + 2^{j_2}). \tag{5.58}$$

If v_{λ_0} has the highest dispersion modulation, using a similar way as in (5.16)–(5.18), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_1 &\lesssim \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ j_1\ll j_2\approx j_3} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2}\|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{L^2_tL^\infty_x}\|u_{-I_{j_1}}\|_{L^\infty_tL^2_x}\|u_{I_{j_2}}\|_{L^4_{x,t}}\|\partial_x u_{-\lambda_0+I_{j_3}}\|_{L^4_{x,t}}\\
&\lesssim \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ j_1\ll j_2\approx j_3} (\langle\lambda_0\rangle+2^{j_2})^{-1/2}\|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V^2_\Delta}\|u_{-I_{j_1}}\|_{V^2_\Delta}\|u_{I_{j_2}}\|_{L^4_{x,t}}\|\partial_x u_{-\lambda_0+I_{j_3}}\|_{L^4_{x,t}}\\
&\lesssim T^{2\varepsilon/3}\sum_{j_1\ll j_3,\ \lambda_0\ll 0} 2^{-j_1/p}2^{(-2/p+2\varepsilon)j_3}\|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V^2_\Delta}\|u\|_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}(-\lambda_0+I_{j_3})}\|u\|^2_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}\\
&\lesssim T^{\varepsilon/2}\|u\|^3_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}\|v\|_{Y_{p',\Delta}}. \end{aligned}\tag{5.59}$$

If $u_{-I_{j_1}}$ has the highest dispersion modulation, the estimate of Γ_1 is similar to (5.59) by considering

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_1 &\lesssim \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ j_1\ll j_2\approx j_3} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2}\|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t}}\|u_{-I_{j_1}}\|_{L^2_{x,t}}\|u_{I_{j_2}}\|_{L^4_{x,t}}\|\partial_x u_{-\lambda_0+I_{j_3}}\|_{L^4_{x,t}}\\
&\lesssim \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ j_1\ll j_2\approx j_3} (\langle\lambda_0\rangle+2^{j_2})^{-1/2}\|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V^2_\Delta}\|u_{-I_{j_1}}\|_{V^2_\Delta}\|u_{I_{j_2}}\|_{L^4_{x,t}}\|\partial_x u_{-\lambda_0+I_{j_3}}\|_{L^4_{x,t}}, \end{aligned}\tag{5.60}$$

for which the right hand side of (5.60) is the same one as the second inequality of (5.59).

If $u_{I_{j_2}}$ gains the highest dispersion modulation, using (5.58), the bilinear estimate (4.1) and Corollaries 3.3, 3.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_1 &\lesssim \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ j_1\ll j_2\approx j_3} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2}\|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t}}\|u_{I_{j_2}}\|_{L^2_{x,t}}\|u_{-I_{j_1}}\partial_x\overline{u}_{-\lambda_0+I_{j_3}}\|_{L^2_{x,t}}\\
&\lesssim \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ j_1\ll j_2\approx j_3} (\langle\lambda_0\rangle+2^{j_2})^{\varepsilon}\|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V^2_\Delta}\|u_{-I_{j_1}}\|_{V^2_\Delta}\|u_{I_{j_2}}\|_{V^2_\Delta}\|u_{-\lambda_0+I_{j_3}}\|_{V^2_\Delta}\\
&\lesssim T^{\varepsilon/4}\sum_{j_1\ll j_3,\ \lambda_0\ll 0} 2^{-j_1/p}2^{(-2/p+\varepsilon)j_3}\|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V^2_\Delta}\|u\|_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}(-\lambda_0+I_{j_3})}\|u\|^2_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}\\
&\lesssim T^{\varepsilon/4}\|u\|^3_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}\|v\|_{Y_{p',\Delta}}. \end{aligned}\tag{5.61}$$

If $u_{-\lambda_0+I_{j_3}}$ has the highest dispersion modulation, one can use similar way as in (5.61) to get the same estimate and we omit the details.

Case a_+a_+h. Finally, we consider the following case as in Table 3.

Case	$\lambda_1\in$	$\lambda_2\in$	$\lambda_3\in$
a_+a_+h	$[0,\infty)$	$[0,\infty)$	$[\lambda_0,\infty)$

Table 3: $\lambda_1,\lambda_2,\lambda_3\geqslant 0$.

In view of FCC (5.5) we see that $\lambda_3\in[-\lambda_0-C,\infty)$. We consider the dyadic collections of λ_k:

$$\lambda_k\in[0,\infty)=\bigcup_{j_k} I_{j_k},\ k=1,2;\quad \lambda_3\in[-\lambda_0-C,\infty)=\bigcup_{j_3\geqslant -1}(-\lambda_0+I_{j_3}),\quad j_{-1}=[-C,0).$$

From FCC (5.5) it follows that $j_3 \approx (j_1 \vee j_2)$. We need to estimate

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{L}^{-}_{l_-a_+h_+}(u,v) &:= \sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0}\langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2}\left|\int_{[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}}\overline{v}_{\lambda_0}u_{[0,\infty)}u_{[0,\infty)}\partial_x\overline{u}_{[-\lambda_0-C,\infty)}\,dxdt\right| \\ &\lesssim \left(\sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ j_1\ll j_2\approx j_3}+\sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ j_2\ll j_1\approx j_3}+\sum_{\lambda_0\ll 0,\ j_1\approx j_2\approx j_3}\right)\langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} \\ &\quad\times\int_{[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}}|\overline{v}_{\lambda_0}u_{I_{j_1}}u_{I_{j_2}}\partial_x\overline{u}_{-\lambda_0+I_{j_3}}|\,dxdt := \Upsilon_1+\Upsilon_2+\Upsilon_3. \qquad (5.62)\end{aligned}$$

It suffices to estimate Υ_1. The highest dispersion modulation in the right hand side of Υ_1 satisfies

$$\max_{0\leqslant k\leqslant 3}|\xi_k^2+\tau_k| \gtrsim (\langle\lambda_0\rangle+2^{j_1})(\langle\lambda_0\rangle+2^{j_2}). \qquad (5.63)$$

Now we compare the highest dispersion modulation between (5.58) and (5.63), we see that the the highest modulation in Υ_1 is larger than that of Γ_1. If v_{λ_0} has the highest dispersion modulation, using the same estimates as in (5.59) for $u_{I_{j_1}},\ u_{I_{j_2}},\ \partial_x\overline{u}_{-\lambda_0+I_{j_3}}$ in the spaces $V^2_\Delta,\ L^4_{x,t}$, we can obtain that Υ_1 has the same upper bound as that of Γ_1 in (5.59). The other cases are also similar to those estimates in (5.60) and (5.61).

Step 2. We consider the case that λ_0 is the secondly minimal integer in $\lambda_0,...,\lambda_3$. Namely, there is a bijection $\pi:\{1,2,3\}\to\{1,2,3\}$ such that

$$\lambda_{\pi(1)}\leqslant\lambda_0\leqslant\lambda_{\pi(2)}\vee\lambda_{\pi(3)}. \qquad (5.64)$$

Step 2.1. We assume that $\lambda_0\gg 0$ and $\lambda_1=\lambda_{\pi(1)}$. By (5.64), we need to estimate

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{L}(u,v) &:= \sum_{\lambda_0\gg 0}\langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2}\int_{[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}}\overline{v}_{\lambda_0}u_{(-\infty,\lambda_0)}u_{[\lambda_0,\infty)}\partial_x\overline{u}_{[\lambda_0,\infty)}\,dxdt \\ &= \sum_{\lambda_0\gg 0}\langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2}\int_{[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}}\overline{v}_{\lambda_0}u_{(-\infty,-\lambda_0/2)}u_{[\lambda_0,\infty)}\partial_x\overline{u}_{[\lambda_0,\infty)}\,dxdt \\ &\quad+\sum_{\lambda_0\gg 0}\langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2}\int_{[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}}\overline{v}_{\lambda_0}u_{[-\lambda_0/2,\lambda_0/2)}u_{[\lambda_0,\infty)}\partial_x\overline{u}_{[\lambda_0,\infty)}\,dxdt \\ &\quad+\sum_{\lambda_0\gg 0}\langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2}\int_{[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}}\overline{v}_{\lambda_0}u_{[\lambda_0/2,\lambda_0]}u_{[\lambda_0,\infty)}\partial_x\overline{u}_{[\lambda_0,\infty)}\,dxdt \\ &:= \mathscr{L}^-(u,v)+\mathscr{L}^0(u,v)+\mathscr{L}^+(u,v). \qquad (5.65)\end{aligned}$$

First, we estimate $\mathscr{L}^0(u,v)$. From FCC (5.5) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{L}^0(u,v) &= \sum_{\lambda_0\gg 0}\langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2}\int_{[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}}\overline{v}_{\lambda_0}u_{[-\lambda_0/2,0)}u_{[2\lambda_0-C,\infty)}\partial_x\overline{u}_{[\lambda_0,\infty)}\,dxdt \\ &\quad+\sum_{\lambda_0\gg 0}\langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2}\int_{[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}}\overline{v}_{\lambda_0}u_{[0,\lambda_0/2)}u_{[3\lambda_0/2-C,\infty)}\partial_x\overline{u}_{[\lambda_0,\infty)}\,dxdt\end{aligned}$$

$$:= \mathscr{L}^{0,-}(u,v) + \mathscr{L}^{0,+}(u,v). \tag{5.66}$$

We further divide $\mathscr{L}^{0,+}(u,v)$ into two parts

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{L}^{0,+}(u,v) &= \sum_{\lambda_0 \gg 0} \langle \lambda_0 \rangle^{1/2} \int_{[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}} \overline{v}_{\lambda_0} u_{[0,\lambda_0/2)} u_{[3\lambda_0/2-C,2\lambda_0)} \partial_x \overline{u}_{[\lambda_0,\infty)}\, dxdt \\ &\quad + \sum_{\lambda_0 \gg 0} \langle \lambda_0 \rangle^{1/2} \int_{[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}} \overline{v}_{\lambda_0} u_{[0,\lambda_0/2)} u_{[2\lambda_0,\infty)} \partial_x \overline{u}_{[\lambda_0,\infty)}\, dxdt \\ &:= \mathscr{L}_l^{0,+}(u,v) + \mathscr{L}_h^{0,+}(u,v). \end{aligned} \tag{5.67}$$

Again, in view of FCC (5.5) we have

$$\mathscr{L}_l^{0,+}(u,v) = \sum_{\lambda_0 \gg 0} \langle \lambda_0 \rangle^{1/2} \int_{[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}} \overline{v}_{\lambda_0} u_{[0,\lambda_0/2)} u_{[3\lambda_0/2-C,2\lambda_0)} \partial_x \overline{u}_{[\lambda_0,3\lambda_0/2+C)}\, dxdt. \tag{5.68}$$

In the right hand side of $\mathscr{L}_l^{0,+}(u,v)$, by DMCC (5.6) we have

$$\bigvee_{k=0}^{3} |\xi_k^2 + \tau_k| \gtrsim \langle \lambda_0 \rangle^2.$$

By Corollary 3.3 we have

$$\|u_{([,\lambda_0/2)}\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2 \cap V_\Delta^2} \leqslant \sum_{j \leqslant \log_2^{\lambda_0}+1} \|u_{I_j}\|_{V_\Delta^2} \lesssim \|u\|_{X_{p,\Delta}^{1/2}}. \tag{5.69}$$

If v_{λ_0} gains the highest dispersion modulation, by Hölder's inequality, the dispersion modulation decay estimate (2.4), (5.69) and Lemma 3.5, we have for $0 < \varepsilon < 1/4p$,

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathscr{L}_l^{0,+}(u,v)| &\lesssim \sum_{\lambda_0 \gg 0} \langle \lambda_0 \rangle^{-1/2} \|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V_\Delta^2} \|u_{[0,\lambda_0/2)}\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \|u_{[3\lambda_0/2-C,2\lambda_0)}\|_{L_{x,t}^4} \|\partial_x \overline{u}_{[\lambda_0,3\lambda_0/2+C)}\|_{L_{x,t}^4} \\ &\lesssim T^{\varepsilon/2} \sum_{\lambda_0 \gg 0} \langle \lambda_0 \rangle^{-2/p+2\varepsilon} \|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V_\Delta^2} \|u\|_{X_{p,\Delta}^{1/2}}^3 \lesssim T^{\varepsilon/2} \|u\|_{X_{p,\Delta}^{1/2}}^3. \end{aligned} \tag{5.70}$$

If $u_{[0,\lambda_0/2)}$ the highest dispersion modulation, taking $L_{x,t}^\infty, L_{x,t}^2, L_{x,t}^4, L_{x,t}^4$ norms to v_{λ_0}, $u_{[0,\lambda_0/2)}$, $u_{[3\lambda_0/2-C,2\lambda_0)}$, $\partial_x \overline{u}_{[\lambda_0,3\lambda_0/2+C)}$, then applying (2.4), we have

$$|\mathscr{L}_l^{0,+}(u,v)| \lesssim \sum_{\lambda_0 \gg 0} \langle \lambda_0 \rangle^{-1/2} \|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V_\Delta^2} \|u_{[0,\lambda_0/2)}\|_{V_\Delta^2} \|u_{[3\lambda_0/2-C,2\lambda_0)}\|_{L_{x,t}^4} \|\partial_x \overline{u}_{[\lambda_0,3\lambda_0/2+C)}\|_{L_{x,t}^4},$$

which reduces the same estimate as the first inequality in (5.70).

Let $u_{[3\lambda_0/2-C,2\lambda_0)}$ have the highest dispersion modulation. Taking $L_{x,t}^\infty, L_{x,t}^2, L_{x,t}^2$ norms to v_{λ_0}, $u_{[3\lambda_0/2-C,2\lambda_0)}$, $u_{[0,\lambda_0/2)} \partial_x \overline{u}_{[\lambda_0,3\lambda_0/2+C)}$, then applying the dispersion modulation decay (2.4) to $u_{[3\lambda_0/2-C,2\lambda_0)}$ and the bilinear estimate (4.1) to $u_{(0,\lambda_0/2]} \partial_x \overline{u}_{[\lambda_0,3\lambda_0/2+C)}$, one obtains that $\mathscr{L}_l^{0,+}(u,v)$ has the desired estimate. When $\partial_x u_{[\lambda_0,3\lambda_0/2+C)}$ has the highest dispersion modulation, the argument is similar.

Now we estimate $\mathscr{L}_h^{0,+}(u,v)$. We adopt the following decompositions:

$$\lambda_1\in(0,\lambda_0/2)=\bigcup_{j_1>0}I_{j_1},\quad \lambda_2\in[2\lambda_0,\infty)=\bigcup_{j_2\geqslant 0}(2\lambda_0+I_{j_2}),\quad \lambda_3\in[\lambda_0,\infty)=\bigcup_{j_3\geqslant 0}(\lambda_0+I_{j_3}).$$

By FCC (5.5), we have

$$j_3\approx j_1\vee j_2,\quad j_1\leqslant\log_2^{\lambda_0}+1.$$

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathscr{L}_h^{0,+}(u,v)|&\leqslant\sum_{\lambda_0\gg 0,\ j_3\approx j_1\vee j_2}\langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2}\int_{[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}}|\overline{v}_{\lambda_0}u_{I_{j_1}}u_{2\lambda_0+I_{j_2}}\partial_x\overline{u}_{\lambda_0+I_{j_3}}|\,dxdt\\&\leqslant\left(\sum_{\lambda_0\gg 0,\ j_1\ll j_3\approx j_2}+\sum_{\lambda_0\gg 0,\ j_2\ll j_3\approx j_1}+\sum_{\lambda_0\gg 0,\ j_1\approx j_2\approx j_3}\right)\langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2}\\&\quad\times\int_{[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}}|\overline{v}_{\lambda_0}u_{I_{j_1}}u_{2\lambda_0+I_{j_2}}\partial_x\overline{u}_{\lambda_0+I_{j_3}}|\,dxdt=I+II+III.\end{aligned}\tag{5.71}$$

In the right hand side of (5.71), by DMCC (5.6) we have

$$\bigvee_{k=0}^{3}|\xi_k^2+\tau_k|\gtrsim\langle\lambda_0\rangle(\langle\lambda_0\rangle+2^{j_2}).\tag{5.72}$$

Noticing that (5.72) is the same as (5.58), we can follow the same ideas in the estimates of Γ_1 to get the bound of I, see (5.59)–(5.61).

Let us observe that $j_1,j_2,j_3\lesssim\ln\lambda_0$ in II and III. It follows that the estimates of II and III are easier than that of I. We omit the details.

$\mathscr{L}^{0,-}(u,v)$ can be handled in a similar way as that of $\mathscr{L}_h^{0,+}(u,v)$ and we omit the details.

Now we estimate $\mathscr{L}^{+}(u,v)$. We use the dyadic decomposition

$$\lambda_1\in(\lambda_0/2,\lambda_0)=\bigcup_{j_1>0}(\lambda_0-I_{j_1}),\quad \lambda_k\in[\lambda_0,\infty)=\bigcup_{j_k\geqslant 0}(\lambda_0+I_{j_k}),\quad k=2,3.$$

By FCC (5.5), we have

$$j_2\approx j_1\vee j_3\quad j_1\leqslant\log_2^{\lambda_0}+1.$$

$$|\mathscr{L}^{+}(u,v)|\leqslant\sum_{\lambda_0\gg 0,\ j_2\approx j_1\vee j_3}\langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2}\int_{[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}}|\overline{v}_{\lambda_0}u_{\lambda_0-I_{j_1}}u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_2}}\partial_x\overline{u}_{\lambda_0+I_{j_3}}|\,dxdt.\tag{5.73}$$

Comparing (5.73) with (5.7), we see that $\mathscr{L}^{+}(u,v)$ in (5.73) is rather similar to (5.7) in Step 1.1. We omit the details of the proof.

We estimate $\mathscr{L}^{-}(u,v)$. In view of FCC (5.5) we see that

$$\mathscr{L}^{-}(u,v)=\sum_{\lambda_0\gg 0}\langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2}\int_{[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}}\overline{v}_{\lambda_0}u_{(-\infty,\ -\lambda_0/2]}u_{[5\lambda_0/2-C,\ \infty)}\partial_x\overline{u}_{[\lambda_0,\ \infty)}\,dxdt.\tag{5.74}$$

Decompose λ_k in the following dyadic way:

$$\lambda_1 \in (-\infty, -\lambda_0/2] = \bigcup_{j_1 \geqslant 0} (-\lambda_0/2 - I_{j_1}), \quad \lambda_3 \in [\lambda_0, \infty) = \bigcup_{j_k \geqslant 0} (\lambda_0 + I_{j_3})$$
$$\lambda_2 \in [5\lambda_0/2 - C, \infty) = \bigcup_{j_2 \geqslant -1} (5\lambda_0/2 + I_{j_2}), \ j_{-1} = [-C, 0).$$

It follows that $j_2 \approx j_1 \vee j_3$.

$$|\mathscr{L}^-(u,v)| \leqslant \sum_{\lambda_0 \gg 0, \ j_2 \approx j_1 \vee j_3} \langle \lambda_0 \rangle^{1/2} \int_{[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}} |\overline{v}_{\lambda_0} u_{-\lambda_0/2 - I_{j_1}} u_{5\lambda_0/2 + I_{j_2}} \partial_x \overline{u}_{\lambda_0 + I_{j_3}}| \, dxdt. \tag{5.75}$$

By DMCC (5.6) we have

$$\max_{0 \leqslant k \leqslant 3} |\xi_k^2 + \tau_k| \gtrsim (\langle \lambda_0 \rangle + 2^{j_1})(\langle \lambda_0 \rangle + 2^{j_2}). \tag{5.76}$$

By (5.76), we see that the dispersion modulation estimate (2.4) gives better decay. So, the estimate of $\mathscr{L}^-(u,v)$ is easier than that of the above cases and we will not perform the details.

Step 2.2. We consider the case $\lambda_0 \ll 0$, $\lambda_1 < \lambda_0 \leqslant \lambda_2 \vee \lambda_3$. According to the size of λ_2, we divide the proof into four subcases $\lambda_2 \in h_-$, $\lambda_2 \in l_-$, $\lambda_2 \in [0, -3\lambda_0/4)$ and $\lambda_2 \in [-3\lambda_0/4, \infty)$. Moreover, in view of FCC (5.5), in order to keep the left hand side of (5.4) nonzero, it suffices to consider the following four subcases in Table 4.

Case	$\lambda_1 \in$	$\lambda_2 \in$	$\lambda_3 \in$
1	$[5\lambda_0/4 - C, \lambda_0)$	$[\lambda_0, 3\lambda_0/4)$	$[\lambda_0, 3\lambda_0/4 + C)$
2	$[2\lambda_0 - C, \lambda_0)$	$[3\lambda_0/4, \ 0)$	$[\lambda_0, C)$
3	$(11\lambda_0/4 - C, \lambda_0)$	$[0, -3\lambda_0/4)$	$[\lambda_0, -3\lambda_0/4 + C)$
4	$(-\infty, \lambda_0)$	$[-3\lambda_0/4, \infty)$	$[\lambda_0, \infty)$

Table 4: $\lambda_0 \ll 0, \quad \lambda_1 < \lambda_0 \leqslant \lambda_2 \vee \lambda_3$.

Case 1. Let us observe that all λ_k $(k = 1, 2, 3)$ are localized in a neighbourhood of λ_0, which is essentially the same as in Case h_-h_-a as in Step 1.2, we omit the details of the proof.

Case 2. Similar to Case $h_-l_-l_-$ as in Step 1.2 and we omit its proof.

Case 3. By separating $\lambda_3 \in [\lambda_0, -3\lambda_0/4 + C) = [\lambda_0, 0) \cup [0, -3\lambda_0/4 + C)$, we see that this case is quite similar to Case 2.

Case 4. Observing that λ_1 and λ_2 are far away from 0, but $\lambda_3 \in [\lambda_0, \infty)$ containing 0, we need to further split $[\lambda_0, \infty)$ into $[\lambda_0, 0)$ and $[0, \infty)$. We consider the following two subcases of Case 4, see Table 5.

Case	$\lambda_1 \in$	$\lambda_2 \in$	$\lambda_3 \in$
4.1	$(-\infty, \lambda_0)$	$[-3\lambda_0/4, \infty)$	$[\lambda_0, 0)$
4.2	$(-\infty, \lambda_0)$	$[-3\lambda_0/4, \infty)$	$[0, \infty)$

Table 5: Two subcases of Case 4.

Case 4.1. By FCC (5.5), we have $\lambda_1 \in (-\infty, 7\lambda_0/4 + C)$. So, we need to estimate

$$\mathscr{L}^{2,\infty}(u,v) := \sum_{\lambda_0 \ll 0} \langle \lambda_0 \rangle^{1/2} \int_{[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}} \overline{v}_{\lambda_0} u_{(-\infty,\ 7\lambda_0/4+C)} u_{[-3\lambda_0/4,\ \infty)} \partial_x \overline{u}_{[\lambda_0,\ 0)}\, dxdt. \quad (5.77)$$

We can decompose λ_k in the following way:

$$\lambda_1 \in (-\infty, 7\lambda_0/4 + C) = \bigcup_{j_1 \geqslant -1} (7\lambda_0/4 - I_{j_1}), I_{-1} = [-C, 0),$$
$$\lambda_2 \in (-3\lambda_0/4, \infty) = \bigcup_{j_1 \geqslant 0} (-3\lambda_0/4 + I_{j_1}), \quad \lambda_3 \in [\lambda_0, 0) = \bigcup_{j_3 \geqslant 0} -I_{j_3}.$$

It follows that $j_1 \approx j_2 \vee j_3$, $j_3 \leqslant 1 + \log_2^{|\lambda_0|}$

$$|\mathscr{L}^{2,\infty}(u,v)| \leqslant \sum_{\lambda_0 \ll 0,\ j_1 \approx j_2 \vee j_3} \langle \lambda_0 \rangle^{1/2} \int_{[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}} |\overline{v}_{\lambda_0} u_{7\lambda_0/4 - I_{j_1}} u_{-3\lambda_0/4 + I_{j_2}} \partial_x \overline{u}_{-I_{j_3}}|\, dxdt. \quad (5.78)$$

By DMCC (5.6) we have

$$\max_{0 \leqslant k \leqslant 3} |\xi_k^2 + \tau_k| \gtrsim (\langle \lambda_0 \rangle + 2^{j_1})(\langle \lambda_0 \rangle + 2^{j_2}). \quad (5.79)$$

One can imitate the procedure as in Case $l_- a_+ h_+$ in Step 1.2 to obtain the result, as desired.

Case 4.2. We need to estimate

$$\mathscr{L}^{3,\infty}(u,v) := \sum_{\lambda_0 \ll 0} \langle \lambda_0 \rangle^{1/2} \int_{[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}} \overline{v}_{\lambda_0} u_{(-\infty,\ \lambda_0)} u_{[-3\lambda_0/4,\ \infty)} \partial_x \overline{u}_{[0,\ \infty)}\, dxdt. \quad (5.80)$$

We can decompose λ_k in the following way:

$$\lambda_1 \in (-\infty, \lambda_0) = \bigcup_{j_1 > 0} (\lambda_0 - I_{j_1}),$$
$$\lambda_2 \in (-3\lambda_0/4, \infty) = \bigcup_{j_2} I_{j_2}, \quad \lambda_3 \in [0, \infty) = \bigcup_{j_3 \geqslant 0} I_{j_3}.$$

It follows that $j_2 \approx j_1 \vee j_3$, $j_2 \geqslant \log_2^{|\lambda_0|} - C$

$$|\mathscr{L}^{3,\infty}(u,v)| \leqslant \sum_{\lambda_0 \ll 0,\ j_1 \vee j_3 \approx j_2 \geqslant \log_2^{|\lambda_0|} - C} \langle \lambda_0 \rangle^{1/2} \int_{[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}} |\overline{v}_{\lambda_0} u_{\lambda_0 - I_{j_1}} u_{I_{j_2}} \partial_x \overline{u}_{I_{j_3}}|\, dxdt. \quad (5.81)$$

By DMCC (5.6) we have for $j_1 \geqslant 10$,

$$\max_{0\leqslant k\leqslant 3} |\xi_k^2 + \tau_k| \gtrsim 2^{j_1}(\langle\lambda_0\rangle + 2^{j_2}). \tag{5.82}$$

Comparing (5.82) with (5.35), (5.81) and (5.32), one can imitate the procedures as in the Case h_-a_+a to obtain the result, as desired. The details are omitted.

Step 2.3. We consider the remaining cases. If $\pi(1) = 2$, namely λ_2 is the smallest one in all λ_k, by symmetry we see that it is the same as the case $\pi(1) = 1$. If $\pi(1) = 3$, it follows from FCC (5.5) we have $\lambda_0 \approx \lambda_1 \approx \lambda_2 \approx \lambda_3$. So, the summation in the left hand side of (5.4) is essentially on λ_0, the other summations are finitely many. By Hölder's inequality we have the result, as desired.

Step 3. We consider the case $|\lambda_0| \lesssim 1$. It follows that $\langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} \sim 1$ in the left hand side of (5.4), which means that we have gained half order derivative. So, this case becomes easier to handle and the details of the proof are omitted.

6 Quintic linear estimates

For the sake of convenience, we denote for $w = (w^{(0)}, ..., w^{(5)})$,

$$\mathscr{L}(w) = \sum_{\lambda_0,\ldots,\lambda_5\in\mathbb{Z}} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}\times[0,T]} \prod_{k=0}^{5} w_{\lambda_k}^{(k)}(x,t)dxdt, \tag{6.1}$$

In the following we always assume that

$$w_{\lambda_k}^{(k)} = u_{\lambda_k}, \quad k = 1, 3, 5; \quad w_{\lambda_0}^{(0)} = \overline{v}_{\lambda_0}, \ w^{(k)} = \overline{u}_{\lambda_k}, \ k = 2, 4, \tag{6.2}$$

which means that for $w = (\bar{v}, u, \bar{u}, u, \bar{u}, u)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{L}(w) &= \sum_{\lambda_0,\ldots,\lambda_5\in\mathbb{Z}} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}\times[0,T]} \overline{v}_{\lambda_0} u_{\lambda_1} \overline{u}_{\lambda_2} u_{\lambda_3} \overline{u}_{\lambda_4} u_{\lambda_5}(x,t)dxdt \\ &= \sum_{\lambda_0\in\mathbb{Z}} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}\times[0,T]} \overline{v}_{\lambda_0} |u|^4 u(x,t)dxdt. \end{aligned} \tag{6.3}$$

Our goal in this section is to show that

Lemma 6.1 *Let $p \in [4, \infty)$, $0 < T < 1$, $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$. Let $\mathscr{L}(w)$ be as in (6.1) and (6.2). We have*

$$|\mathscr{L}(w)| \lesssim T^{\varepsilon} \|v\|_{Y^0_{p',\Delta}} \|u\|^5_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}} \tag{6.4}$$

and by duality,

$$\||u|^4 u\|_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}} \lesssim T^{\varepsilon} \|u\|^5_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}. \tag{6.5}$$

We divide the proof of Lemma 6.1 into a few steps according to the size of λ_0. We can assume that $\lambda_0 > 0$, since in the opposite case one can substitute $\lambda_0, ..., \lambda_5$ by $-\lambda_0, .., -\lambda_5$.

Step 1. Let us assume that $\lambda_0, ..., \lambda_5$ satisfy

$$\lambda_0 = \max_{0\leqslant k\leqslant 5} |\lambda_k|. \tag{6.6}$$

For short, considering the higher, lower and all frequency of λ_k, we use the following notations:

$$\begin{cases} \lambda_k \in h \Leftrightarrow \lambda_k \in [c\lambda_0, \lambda_0] \\ \lambda_k \in h_- \Leftrightarrow \lambda_k \in [-\lambda_0, -c\lambda_0] \\ \lambda_k \in l \Leftrightarrow \lambda_k \in [0, c\lambda_0] \\ \lambda_k \in l_- \Leftrightarrow \lambda_k \in [-c\lambda_0, 0] \\ \lambda_k \in a \Leftrightarrow \lambda_k \in [-\lambda_0, \lambda_0] \\ \lambda_k \in a_+ \Leftrightarrow \lambda_k \in [0, \lambda_0] \\ \lambda_k \in a_- \Leftrightarrow \lambda_k \in [-\lambda_0, 0] \end{cases}$$

for some $c > 0$. First, we consider the case that there are two higher frequency in $\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_5$, say, λ_1, λ_3 belong to higher frequency intervals. We denote by $(\lambda_k) \in hhaaa$ that all $\lambda_0, ..., \lambda_5$ satisfy conditions (6.6) and

$$\lambda_1, \lambda_3 \in h, \quad \lambda_2, \lambda_4, \lambda_5 \in a. \tag{6.7}$$

For $w = (\bar{v}, u, \bar{u}, u, \bar{u}, u)$, we write

$$\mathscr{L}_{hhaaa}(w) = \sum_{(\lambda_k)\in hhaaa} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}\times[0,T]} \prod_{k=0}^{5} w_{\lambda_k}^{(k)}(x,t)dxdt, \tag{6.8}$$

we will always use the notation

$$\mathscr{L}_{bcdef}(w) = \sum_{(\lambda_k)\in bcdef} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}\times[0,T]} \prod_{k=0}^{5} w_{\lambda_k}^{(k)}(x,t)dxdt, \tag{6.9}$$

where $b, c, d, e, f \in \{a, a_+, a_-, h, h_-, l, l_-\}$.

Lemma 6.2 *Let $p \in [4, \infty)$, $0 < T < 1$, $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$. We have*

$$|\mathscr{L}_{bcdef}(w)| \lesssim T^{\varepsilon} \|v\|_{Y^0_{p',\Delta}} \|u\|^5_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}} \tag{6.10}$$

if at least two ones in "b, c, d, e, f" belong to $\{h, h_-\}$.

Proof. *Case $hha_+a_+a_+$.* We denote by $(\lambda_k) \in hha_+a_+a_+$ the case that $\lambda_0, ..., \lambda_5$ satisfy (6.6) and

$$\lambda_k \in h, \ k = 1, 3, \quad \lambda_2, \lambda_4, \lambda_5 \in a_+. \tag{6.11}$$

We decompose $\lambda_2, \lambda_4, \lambda_5$ in a dyadic way:

$$\lambda_k \in [0, \lambda_0] = \bigcup_{j_k \geqslant 0} I_{j_k}, \quad k = 2, 4, 5; \quad 0 \leqslant j_2, j_4, j_5 \leqslant \log_2^{\lambda_0}. \tag{6.12}$$

We can assume that $\lambda_0 \gg 1$. Assume that $j_{\max} = j_2 \vee j_4 \vee j_5$, $j_{\min} = j_2 \wedge j_4 \wedge j_5$ and j_{med} is the secondly larger one in $\{j_2, j_4, j_5\}$ in (6.12). By Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathscr{L}_{hha_+a_+a_+}(w)| \lesssim & \sum_{\lambda_0;\ j_{\min}, j_{\mathrm{med}}, j_{\max} \leqslant \log_2^{\lambda_0}} \langle \lambda_0 \rangle^{1/2} \|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t}} \prod_{k=1,3} \|w^{(k)}_{[c\lambda_0, \lambda_0]}\|_{L^4_{x,t\in[0,T]}} \\ & \times \|u_{I_{j_{\max}}}\|_{L^4_{x,t\in[0,T]}} \|u_{I_{j_{\mathrm{med}}}}\|_{L^4_{x,t\in[0,T]}} \|u_{I_{j_{\min}}}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t\in[0,T]}} \end{aligned} \tag{6.13}$$

In view of $V^2_\Delta \subset L^\infty_t L^2_x$, $\|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{L^\infty_x} \lesssim \|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{L^2_x}$, by Corollaries 3.3 and 3.5, one has that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathscr{L}_{hha_+a_+a_+}(w)| \lesssim & T^{4\varepsilon/3} \sum_{\lambda_0;\ j_{\min}, j_{\mathrm{med}}, j_{\max} \leqslant \log_2^{\lambda_0}} \langle \lambda_0 \rangle^{1/2} \|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V^2_\Delta} \langle \lambda_0 \rangle^{2(-1/4-1/p+\varepsilon)} \|u\|^2_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}} \\ & \times 2^{(j_{\max}+j_{\mathrm{med}})(-1/4-1/p+\varepsilon)} \|u\|^2_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}} 2^{j_{\min}(1/2-1/p)} \|u\|_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.14}$$

Choosing $0 < \varepsilon < 1/2p$, and making the summation on $j_{\min}$, j_{med} and $j_{\max}$ in order, one obtain that

$$|\mathscr{L}_{hha_+a_+a_+}(w)| \lesssim T^{4\varepsilon/3} \sum_{\lambda_0} \langle \lambda_0 \rangle^{-2/p+2\varepsilon} \|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V^2_\Delta} \|u\|^5_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}. \tag{6.15}$$

Noticing that $\{\langle \lambda_0 \rangle^{-2/p+2\varepsilon}\} \in \ell^p$, by Hölder's inequality we have

$$|\mathscr{L}_{hha_+a_+a_+}(w)| \lesssim T^\varepsilon \|v\|_{Y^0_{p',\Delta}} \|u\|^5_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}. \quad (0 < \varepsilon \leqslant 1/2p) \tag{6.16}$$

Case $hha_+a_+a_-$. We denote by $(\lambda_k) \in hha_+a_+a_-$ the case that $\lambda_0, ..., \lambda_5$ satisfy (6.6) and

$$\lambda_k \in [c\lambda_0, \lambda_0],\ k = 1, 3, \quad \lambda_2, \lambda_4 \in [0, \lambda_0],\ \lambda_5 \in [-\lambda_0, 0]. \tag{6.17}$$

We decompose $\lambda_2, \lambda_4, \lambda_5$ by:

$$\lambda_k \in [0, \lambda_0] = \bigcup_{j_k \geqslant 0} I_{j_k},\ k = 2, 4; \quad \lambda_5 \in [-\lambda_0, 0] = \bigcup_{j_5 \geqslant 0} -I_{j_5}, \quad j_2, j_4, j_5 \leqslant \log_2^{\lambda_0}. \tag{6.18}$$

Repeating the procedures as in Case $hha_+a_+a_+$, we can show that

$$|\mathscr{L}_{hha_+a_+a_-}(w)| \lesssim T^\varepsilon \|v\|_{Y^0_{p',\Delta}} \|u\|^5_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}. \tag{6.19}$$

Recall that in the proof above, the condition that two λ_k is localized in higher frequency, say $\lambda_1, \lambda_3 \in [c\lambda_0, \lambda_0]$ can guarantee that $\{\langle \lambda_0 \rangle^{-2/p+2\varepsilon}\}$ is convergent in ℓ^p. Hence, applying the same way as in the above, we can obtain the result for the other cases which contain two higher frequency and three all frequency.

If some λ_k is only in lower frequency $[0, c\lambda_0]$, the proof is almost the same as in the above. If all λ_k have three or more higher frequency $[c\lambda_0, \lambda_0]$, the proof is easier than the Case $hha_+a_+a_+$, since the dyadic decomposition starting at 0 for the third higher frequency has at most finite dyadic intervals. □

In (6.3), for the sake of symmetry, we can assume that

$$\lambda_1 \geqslant \lambda_3 \geqslant \lambda_5, \quad \lambda_2 \geqslant \lambda_4 \tag{H1}$$

One easily sees that $\lambda_0, ..., \lambda_5$ satisfy the following frequency constrainted condition:

$$\lambda_0 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_4 = \lambda_1 + \lambda_3 + \lambda_5 + l, \ |l| \leqslant 10. \tag{H2}$$

The non-trivial case is that

$$\lambda_0 = \max_{0\leqslant k\leqslant 5} |\lambda_k| \gg 1. \tag{H3}$$

The case $\lambda_0 = \max_{0\leqslant k\leqslant 5} |\lambda_k| \lesssim 1$ implies that the summation in (6.3) has at most finite terms. So, in view of (H1), (H2) and (H3), we see that the orders of $\lambda_0, ..., \lambda_5$ have the following 10 cases:

$$\lambda_0 \geqslant \lambda_2 \geqslant \lambda_1 \geqslant \lambda_3 \geqslant \lambda_5 \geqslant \lambda_4, \tag{Ord1}$$
$$\lambda_0 \geqslant \lambda_1 \geqslant \lambda_2 \geqslant \lambda_3 \geqslant \lambda_5 \geqslant \lambda_4, \tag{Ord2}$$
$$\lambda_0 \geqslant \lambda_1 \geqslant \lambda_3 \geqslant \lambda_5 \geqslant \lambda_2 \geqslant \lambda_4, \tag{Ord3}$$
$$\lambda_0 \geqslant \lambda_1 \geqslant \lambda_3 \geqslant \lambda_2 \geqslant \lambda_4 \geqslant \lambda_5, \tag{Ord4}$$
$$\lambda_0 \geqslant \lambda_1 \geqslant \lambda_3 \geqslant \lambda_2 \geqslant \lambda_5 \geqslant \lambda_4, \tag{Ord5}$$
$$\lambda_0 \geqslant \lambda_1 \geqslant \lambda_2 \geqslant \lambda_3 \geqslant \lambda_4 \geqslant \lambda_5, \tag{Ord6}$$
$$\lambda_0 \geqslant \lambda_1 \geqslant \lambda_2 \geqslant \lambda_4 \geqslant \lambda_3 \geqslant \lambda_5, \tag{Ord7}$$
$$\lambda_0 \geqslant \lambda_2 \geqslant \lambda_4 \geqslant \lambda_1 \geqslant \lambda_3 \geqslant \lambda_5, \tag{Ord8}$$
$$\lambda_0 \geqslant \lambda_2 \geqslant \lambda_1 \geqslant \lambda_3 \geqslant \lambda_4 \geqslant \lambda_5, \tag{Ord9}$$
$$\lambda_0 \geqslant \lambda_2 \geqslant \lambda_1 \geqslant \lambda_4 \geqslant \lambda_3 \geqslant \lambda_5. \tag{Ord10}$$

If there are at least two higher frequency in $\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_5$ which are localized in $[c\lambda_0, \lambda_0] \cup [-\lambda_0, -c\lambda_0]$, in the proof of Lemma 6.2 we neither consider the orders of $\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_5$ nor use the constraint condition (H2). Now we study the case that there is only one higher frequency in $\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_5$. For $\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_5$, if there is only one higher frequency which is localized in $[c\lambda_0, \lambda_0] \cup [-\lambda_0, -c\lambda_0]$, we see that it must be the biggest one localized in $[c\lambda_0, \lambda_0]$ or the smallest one localized in $[-\lambda_0, -c\lambda_0]$, the other frequency is localized in $[-c\lambda_0, c\lambda_0]$.

First, let us consider (Ord4) case according to the high-low frequency. The case $\lambda_5 \in h_-$ and $\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_4 \in l$ or l_- never happens for small $c > 0$. So, it suffices to consider the case $\lambda_1 \in h$. we divide the proof into a few cases, see Table 6.

Case (Ord4)

Case	$\lambda_1 \in$	$\lambda_3 \in$	$\lambda_2 \in$	$\lambda_4 \in$	$\lambda_5 \in$
hllll	h	l	l	l	l
*hllll_*	h	l	l	l	l_-
*hlll_l_*	h	l	l	l_-	l_-
*hll_l_l_*	h	l	l_-	l_-	l_-
*hl_l_l_l_*	h	l_-	l_-	l_-	l_-

Table 6: $\lambda_0 \geqslant \lambda_1 \geqslant \lambda_3 \geqslant \lambda_2 \geqslant \lambda_2 \geqslant \lambda_5$, only one higher frequency in $\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_5$.

Case hllll. We denote by $(\lambda_k) \in$ *hllll* the case that $\lambda_0, ..., \lambda_5$ satisfy (6.6), (Ord4) and

$$\lambda_1 \in h, \quad \lambda_k \in l, \ k = 2, 3, 4, 5. \tag{6.20}$$

We decompose $\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_5$ in a dyadic way:

$$\lambda_1 \in [c\lambda_0, \lambda_0] = \bigcup_{j_1 \geqslant 0} (\lambda_0 - I_{j_1}), \quad \lambda_k \in [0, \lambda_0] = \bigcup_{j_k \geqslant 0} I_{j_k}, \quad k = 2, ..., 5. \tag{6.21}$$

By condition (Ord4) we see that

$$0 \leqslant j_5 \leqslant j_4 \leqslant j_2 \leqslant j_3 \leqslant \log_2^{\lambda_0}. \tag{6.22}$$

One has that

$$\mathscr{L}_{hllll}(w) \leqslant \sum_{\lambda_0;\ j_1;\ j_5 \leqslant j_4 \leqslant j_2 \leqslant j_3 \leqslant \log_2^{\lambda_0}} \langle \lambda_0 \rangle^{1/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}\times[0,T]} |\overline{v}_{\lambda_0} u_{\lambda_0 - I_{j_1}} \prod_{k=2}^{5} w_{I_{j_k}}^{(k)}(x,t)| dxdt, \tag{6.23}$$

Using the frequency constraint condition (H2), we see that $j_1 > j_3 + 10$ implies that $\mathscr{L}_{hllll}(w) = 0$. So, we have $j_1 \leqslant j_3 + 10$ in (6.23). By Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathscr{L}_{hllll}(w)| \lesssim & \sum_{\lambda_0;\ j_1;\ j_5 \leqslant j_4 \leqslant j_2 \leqslant j_3 \leqslant \log_2^{\lambda_0}} \langle \lambda_0 \rangle^{1/2} \|\overline{v}_{\lambda_0}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t}} \|u_{\lambda_0 - I_{j_1}}\|_{L^4_{x,t\in[0,T]}} \\ & \times \|u_{I_{j_3}}\|_{L^4_{x,t\in[0,T]}} \|u_{I_{j_2}}\|_{L^4_{x,t\in[0,T]}} \|u_{I_{j_4}}\|_{L^4_{x,t\in[0,T]}} \|u_{I_{j_5}}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t}}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.24}$$

By Corollaries 3.3 and 3.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathscr{L}_{hllll}(w)| \lesssim & T^{4\varepsilon/3} \sum_{\lambda_0;\ j_1 \leqslant j_3 + 10;\ j_5 \leqslant j_4 \leqslant j_2 \leqslant j_3} \langle \lambda_0 \rangle^{1/2} \|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V^2_\Delta} \langle \lambda_0 \rangle^{-1/2} 2^{j_1(1/4 - 1/p + \varepsilon)} \|u\|_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}(\lambda_0 - I_{j_1})} \\ & \times 2^{(j_2 + j_3 + j_4)(-1/4 - 1/p + \varepsilon)} 2^{j_5(1/2 - 1/p)} \|u\|^4_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.25}$$

Taking $0 < \varepsilon \leqslant 1/4p$ and summarizing over all j_5, j_4, j_2 and j_3 in order, we obtain that

$$|\mathscr{L}_{hllll}(w)| \lesssim T^{\varepsilon} \sum_{\lambda_0;\ j_1 \leqslant j_3 + 10} \|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V^2_\Delta} 2^{j_1(1/4 - 1/p + \varepsilon)} 2^{j_3(-1/4 - 1/p + \varepsilon)} \|u\|_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}(\lambda_0 - I_{j_1})} \|u\|^4_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}$$

$$\lesssim T^{\varepsilon}\sum_{\lambda_0;\ j_1}\|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V_\Delta^2}2^{j_1(-2/p+2\varepsilon)}\|u\|_{X_{p,\Delta}^{1/2}(\lambda_0-I_{j_1})}\|u\|_{X_{p,\Delta}^{1/2}}^4. \tag{6.26}$$

Noticing that $0<\varepsilon\leqslant 1/4p$, by Hölder's inequality, one has that

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathscr{L}_{hllll}(w)|&\lesssim T^{\varepsilon}\|v\|_{Y^0_{p',\Delta}}\sum_{j_1}2^{-3j_1/2p}\left(\sum_{\lambda_0,\ \lambda\in\lambda_0-I_{j_1}}\langle\lambda\rangle^{p/2}\|u_\lambda\|_{V_\Delta^2}^p\right)^{1/p}\|u\|_{X_{p,\Delta}^{1/2}}^4\\&\lesssim T^{\varepsilon}\|v\|_{Y^0_{p',\Delta}}\|u\|_{X_{p,\Delta}^{1/2}}^5\sum_{j_1}2^{-j_1/2p}\\&\lesssim T^{\varepsilon}\|v\|_{Y^0_{p',\Delta}}\|u\|_{X_{p,\Delta}^{1/2}}^5.\end{aligned} \tag{6.27}$$

Case hllll_. We denote by $(\lambda_k)\in hllll_$ the case that $\lambda_0,...,\lambda_5$ satisfy (6.6), (Ord4) and

$$\lambda_1\in h;\quad \lambda_k\in l,\ k=2,3,4;\quad \lambda_5\in l_-. \tag{6.28}$$

We decompose $\lambda_1,...,\lambda_5$ in a dyadic way:

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_1\in[c\lambda_0,\lambda_0]=\bigcup_{j_1\geqslant 0}(\lambda_0-I_{j_1});\quad \lambda_k\in[0,\lambda_0]=\bigcup_{j_k\geqslant 0}I_{j_k},\quad k=2,3,4;\\ \lambda_5\in[-c\lambda_0,0]=\bigcup_{j_5\geqslant 0}-I_{j_5}.\end{aligned} \tag{6.29}$$

By condition (Ord4) we see that

$$0\leqslant j_4\leqslant j_2\leqslant j_3\leqslant\log_2^{\lambda_0}-C. \tag{6.30}$$

One has that

$$\mathscr{L}_{hllll_}(w)\leqslant\sum_{\lambda_0;\ j_1;\ j_5;\ j_4\leqslant j_2\leqslant j_3\leqslant\log_2^{\lambda_0}}\langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2}\int_{\mathbb{R}\times[0,T]}|\overline{v}_{\lambda_0}u_{\lambda_0-I_{j_1}}u_{-I_{j_5}}\prod_{k=2}^4 w^{(k)}_{I_{j_k}}(x,t)|dxdt. \tag{6.31}$$

Using the frequency constraint condition (H2), we see that

$$j_1\leqslant j_3+C. \tag{6.32}$$

Denote

$$j_{\max}=j_2\vee j_5,\quad j_{\min}=j_4\wedge j_5,\quad j_{\mathrm{med}}\in\{j_2,j_4,j_5\}\setminus\{j_{\max},j_{\min}\}.$$

Following the ideas as in the estimate of Case *hllll*, by Hölder's inequality and Corollaries 3.3, 3.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathscr{L}_{hllll_}(w)|\lesssim T^{\varepsilon}&\sum_{\lambda_0;\ j_1\leqslant j_3+C,\ j_{\max},j_{\mathrm{med}},j_{\min}}\langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2}\|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V_\Delta^2}\langle\lambda_0\rangle^{-1/2}2^{j_1(1/4-1/p+\varepsilon)}\|u\|_{X_{p,\Delta}^{1/2}(\lambda_0-I_{j_1})}\\&\times 2^{(j_3+j_{\max}+j_{\mathrm{med}})(-1/4-1/p+\varepsilon)}2^{j_{\min}(1/2-1/p)}\|u\|_{X_{p,\Delta}^{1/2}}^4.\end{aligned} \tag{6.33}$$

Summarizing over all $j_{\min}, j_{\rm med}, j_{\max}$ in orders, from (6.33) one can control $|\mathscr{L}_{hllll_}(w)|$ by the right hand side of (6.26). So, we have

$$|\mathscr{L}_{hllll_}(w)| \lesssim T^{\varepsilon}\|v\|_{Y^0_{p',\Delta}}\|u\|^5_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}. \tag{6.34}$$

Case hlll_l_. We denote by $(\lambda_k) \in hlll_l_$ the case that $\lambda_0, ..., \lambda_5$ satisfy (6.6), (Ord4) and

$$\lambda_1 \in h; \quad \lambda_2, \lambda_3 \in l; \quad \lambda_4, \lambda_5 \in l_-. \tag{6.35}$$

We decompose $\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_5$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1 \in [c\lambda_0, \lambda_0] = \bigcup_{j_1 \geqslant 0}(\lambda_0 - I_{j_1}); \quad \lambda_k \in [0, \lambda_0] = \bigcup_{j_k \geqslant 0} I_{j_k}, \quad k = 2, 3; \\ \lambda_k \in [-c\lambda_0, 0] = \bigcup_{j_k \geqslant 0} -I_{j_k}, \quad k = 4, 5. \end{aligned} \tag{6.36}$$

By condition (Ord4) we see that

$$0 \leqslant j_2 \leqslant j_3 \leqslant \log_2^{\lambda_0} - C, \quad 0 \leqslant j_4 \leqslant j_5 \leqslant \log_2^{\lambda_0} - C. \tag{6.37}$$

One has that

$$\mathscr{L}_{hlll_l_}(w) \leqslant \sum_{\lambda_0;\ j_1;\ j_4 \leqslant j_5;\ j_2 \leqslant j_3 \leqslant \log_2^{\lambda_0}} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}\times[0,T]} |\overline{v}_{\lambda_0} u_{\lambda_0 - I_{j_1}} \overline{u}_{I_{j_2}} u_{I_{j_3}} \overline{u}_{-I_{j_4}} u_{-I_{j_5}}(x,t)| dxdt. \tag{6.38}$$

In view if the frequency constraint condition (H2), we see that

$$I_{j_1} \cap (I_{j_3} + I_{j_4} - I_{j_2} - I_{j_5}) \neq \varnothing.$$

Otherwise $\mathscr{L}_{hlll_l_}(w) = 0$. It follows that

(1) If $j_4 < j_5$, then $j_1 < j_3 + 10$.

(2) If $j_4 = j_5$, then $j_1 < j_3 \vee j_4 + 10$.

In the case $j_4 < j_5$, we can use a similar way as in Case *hllll_*. Indeed, putting

$$j_{\max} = j_2 \vee j_5, \quad j_{\min} = j_4 \wedge j_2, \quad j_{\rm med} \in \{j_2, j_4, j_5\} \setminus \{j_{\max}, j_{\min}\},$$

then we can repeat the procedure as in Case *hllll_* to have the estimate

$$|\mathscr{L}_{hlll_l_}(w)| \lesssim T^{\varepsilon}\|v\|_{Y^0_{p',\Delta}}\|u\|^5_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}. \tag{6.39}$$

In the case $j_4 = j_5$, we need to separate the proof into the case $j_3 \geqslant j_4$ and $j_3 < j_4$, respectively. We have

(2*a*) If $j_3 \leqslant j_4$, then $j_2 \leqslant j_3 \leqslant j_4 = j_5$.

(2*b*) If $j_3 \geqslant j_4$, then $j_3 \geqslant j_4 = j_5 \geqslant j_2$, or $j_3 \geqslant j_2 \geqslant j_4 = j_5$.

In the case $(2b)$, we can use the same way as in Case $hllll_$ to show that (6.39) holds. In the case $(2a)$, we have from Corollaries 3.3 and 3.4 that

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathscr{L}_{hlll_l_}(w)| \lesssim & \sum_{\lambda_0;\ j_1\leqslant j_4+C;\ j_2\leqslant j_3\leqslant j_5=j_4} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2}\|\overline{v}_{\lambda_0}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t}}\|u_{\lambda_0-I_{j_1}}\|_{L^4_{x,t\in[0,T]}}\\ & \times \|u_{I_{j_3}}\|_{L^4_{x,t\in[0,T]}}\|u_{-I_{j_4}}\|_{L^4_{x,t\in[0,T]}}\|u_{-I_{j_5}}\|_{L^4_{x,t\in[0,T]}}\|u_{I_{j_2}}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t}}.\\ \lesssim & T^{4\varepsilon/3}\sum_{\lambda_0;\ j_1\leqslant j_4+C;\ j_2\leqslant j_3\leqslant j_5=j_4} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2}\|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V^2_\Delta}\langle\lambda_0\rangle^{-1/2}2^{j_1(1/4-1/p+\varepsilon)}\|u\|_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}(\lambda_0-I_{j_1})}\\ & \times 2^{(j_5+j_3+j_4)(-1/4-1/p+\varepsilon)}2^{j_2(1/2-1/p)}\|u\|^4_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.40}$$

Making the summation in turn to j_2, j_3 and j_4, we can get (6.39).

Case $hll_l_l_$. We denote by $(\lambda_k)\in hll_l_l_$ the case that $\lambda_0,...,\lambda_5$ satisfy (6.6), (Ord4) and

$$\lambda_1\in h;\quad \lambda_3\in l;\quad \lambda_2,\lambda_4,\lambda_5\in l_. \tag{6.41}$$

We decompose $\lambda_1,...,\lambda_5$ by

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_1\in[c\lambda_0,\lambda_0]=\bigcup_{j_1\geqslant 0}(\lambda_0-I_{j_1});\quad \lambda_3\in[0,\lambda_0]=\bigcup_{j_3\geqslant 0}I_{j_3};\\ \lambda_k\in[-c\lambda_0,0]=\bigcup_{j_k\geqslant 0}-I_{j_k},\quad k=2,4,5.\end{aligned} \tag{6.42}$$

By condition (Ord4) we see that

$$0\leqslant j_2\leqslant j_4\leqslant j_5\leqslant \log_2^{\lambda_0}-C. \tag{6.43}$$

Using the frequency constraint condition (H2), we see that

(i) If $j_3\geqslant j_5$, then $j_1\leqslant j_3+10$.

(ii) If $j_3<j_5$, then $j_1<j_4+10$.

In the case (i), we can follow the same way as in Case $hllll$ to obtain the estimate

$$|\mathscr{L}_{hll_l_l_}(w)|\lesssim T^\varepsilon\|v\|_{Y^0_{p',\Delta}}\|u\|^4_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}. \tag{6.44}$$

In the case (ii), we need to further analyze j_2,j_3,j_4 and denote

$$j_{\max}=j_3\vee j_4,\quad j_{\min}=j_2\wedge j_3,\quad j_{\mathrm{med}}\in\{j_2,j_3,j_4\}\setminus\{j_{\max},j_{\min}\}.$$

Then we can repeat the procedures as in Case $hllll_$ to obtain (6.44).

Case $hl_l_l_l_$. We denote by $(\lambda_k)\in hl_l_l_l_$ the case that $\lambda_0,...,\lambda_5$ satisfy (6.6), (Ord4) and

$$\lambda_1\in h;\quad \lambda_2,...,\lambda_5\in l_. \tag{6.45}$$

We decompose $\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_5$ by

$$\lambda_1 \in [c\lambda_0, \lambda_0] = \bigcup_{j_1 \geqslant 0} (\lambda_0 - I_{j_1}); \qquad \lambda_k \in [-c\lambda_0, 0] = \bigcup_{j_k \geqslant 0} -I_{j_k},\ k = 2, ..., 5. \tag{6.46}$$

By condition (Ord4) we see that

$$0 \leqslant j_3 \leqslant j_2 \leqslant j_4 \leqslant j_5 \leqslant \log_2^{\lambda_0} - C. \tag{6.47}$$

Using the frequency constraint condition (H2), we see that

$$j_5 \leqslant j_4 + 2, \quad j_1 \leqslant j_4 + 10.$$

Noticing that $j_3 \leqslant j_2 \leqslant j_4 \leqslant j_5 \leqslant j_4 + 2$, using a similar way as in Case $hllll$ we can obtain the estimate

$$|\mathscr{L}_{hl_l_l_l_}(w)| \lesssim T^{\varepsilon} \|v\|_{Y^0_{p',\Delta}} \|u\|^4_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}. \tag{6.48}$$

Next, we consider (Ord1) case according to the high-low frequency. The case $\lambda_2 \in h$ and $\lambda_1, \lambda_3, \lambda_4, \lambda_5 \in l$ or $l_$ never happens for small $c > 0$. So, it suffices to consider the case $\lambda_4 \in h_$. We divide the proof into a few cases, see Table 7.

Case (Ord1)

Case	$\lambda_2 \in$	$\lambda_1 \in$	$\lambda_3 \in$	$\lambda_5 \in$	$\lambda_4 \in$
$llllh_$	l	l	l	l	$h_$
$llll_h_$	l	l	l	$l_$	$h_$
$hlll_l_h_$	l	l	$l_$	$l_$	$h_$
$ll_l_l_h_$	l	$l_$	$l_$	$l_$	$h_$
$l_l_l_l_h_$	$l_$	$l_$	$l_$	$l_$	$h_$

Table 7: $\lambda_0 \geqslant \lambda_2 \geqslant \lambda_1 \geqslant \lambda_3 \geqslant \lambda_5 \geqslant \lambda_4$, only one higher frequency in $\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_5$.

We consider the decomposition of λ_k:

$$\lambda_4 \in [-\lambda_0, -c\lambda_0] = \bigcup_{j_4 \geqslant 0} (-\lambda_0 + I_{j_4}), \quad \lambda_k \in [0, c\lambda_0] = \bigcup_{j_k \geqslant 0} I_{j_k}; \quad \lambda_l \in [-c\lambda_0, 0] = \bigcup_{j_l \geqslant 0} -I_{j_l}$$

for any $k, l \in \{1, 2, 3, 5\}$. For short, we denote by $(\lambda_k) \in llllh_$ the case that $\lambda_0, ..., \lambda_5$ satisfy (6.6), (Ord1) and $\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_3, \lambda_5 \in l$, $\lambda_4 \in h_$. Similarly, we will use the notations $(\lambda_k) \in llll_h_, ..., l_l_l_l_h_$.

Using the frequency constraint condition (H2), we see that

$$j_4 \leqslant j_1 + 10 \ \text{ if } \ (\lambda_k) \in llllh_ \cup llll_h_ \cup lll_l_h_.$$
$$j_1 \vee ... \vee j_5 \lesssim 1, \ \text{ if } \ (\lambda_k) \in ll_l_l_h_ \cup l_l_l_l_h_.$$

The Cases $ll_l_l_h_$ and $l_l_l_l_h_$ are trivial and we omit the discussions. For the Cases $llllh_$, $llll_h_$ and $lll_l_h_$, we need to further analyze j_2, j_3, j_5 and write

$$j_{\max} = j_2 \vee j_3 \vee j_5, \quad j_{\min} = j_2 \wedge j_3 \wedge j_5, \quad j_{\mathrm{med}} \in \{j_2, j_3, j_5\} \setminus \{j_{\max}, j_{\min}\}.$$

Similar to (6.33), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\mathscr{L}_{llllh_}(w)| + |\mathscr{L}_{llll_h_}(w)| + |\mathscr{L}_{lll_l_h_}(w)| \\
&\quad \lesssim T^{\varepsilon} \sum_{\lambda_0;\ j_4 \leqslant j_1 + C,\ j_{\max}, j_{\mathrm{med}}, j_{\min}} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} \|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V^2_\Delta} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{-1/2} 2^{j_4(1/4-1/p+\varepsilon)} \|u\|_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}(-\lambda_0+I_{j_4})} \\
&\qquad \times 2^{(j_1+j_{\max}+j_{\mathrm{med}})(-1/4-1/p+\varepsilon)} 2^{j_{\min}(1/2-1/p)} \|u\|^4_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.49}$$

Using the same way as above and making the summation in turn to $j_{\min}, j_{\mathrm{med}}, j_{\max}$ and then to λ_0 and j_4, we have

$$|\mathscr{L}_{llllh_}(w)| + |\mathscr{L}_{llll_h_}(w)| + |\mathscr{L}_{lll_l_h_}(w)| \lesssim T^{\varepsilon} \|v\|_{Y^0_{p',\Delta}} \|u\|^4_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}. \tag{6.50}$$

If $\lambda_0, .., \lambda_5$ has the orders as in (Ord2) and only one of them is lying in higher frequency, there are two possible cases $\lambda_1 \in h$ and $\lambda_4 \in h_$. We discuss these two cases separately.

Case (Ord2): $\lambda_1 \in h$

Case	$\lambda_1 \in$	$\lambda_2 \in$	$\lambda_3 \in$	$\lambda_5 \in$	$\lambda_4 \in$
$hllll$	h	l	l	l	l
$hllll_$	h	l	l	l	$l_$
$hlll_l_$	h	l	l	$l_$	$l_$
$hll_l_l_$	h	l	$l_$	$l_$	$l_$
$hl_l_l_l_$	h	$l_$	$l_$	$l_$	$l_$

Table 8: $\lambda_0 \geqslant \lambda_1 \geqslant \lambda_2 \geqslant \lambda_3 \geqslant \lambda_5 \geqslant \lambda_4$, only one higher frequency in $\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_5$.

As in Table 8, we denote by $(\lambda_k) \in hllll$ that $\lambda_0, .., \lambda_5$ satisfy (6.6), (Ord2) and $\lambda_1 \in h$, $\lambda_2, ..., \lambda_5 \in l$. Similarly for the notations $(\lambda_k) \in hllll_$,...,$hl_l_l_l_$. We consider the decomposition of λ_k:

$$\lambda_1 \in [c\lambda_0, \lambda_0] = \bigcup_{j_4 \geqslant 0} (\lambda_0 - I_{j_1}); \quad \lambda_k \in [0, c\lambda_0] = \bigcup_{j_k \geqslant 0} I_{j_k}, \quad \lambda_l \in [-c\lambda_0, 0] = \bigcup_{j_l \geqslant 0} -I_{j_l}$$

for any $k, l \in \{2, 3, 4, 5\}$. We have the following constraint conditions on $j_1, ..., j_5$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&j_1 \leqslant j_3 + C, \quad j_2 \geqslant j_3 \geqslant j_5 \geqslant j_4 \ \text{ if } \ (\lambda_k) \in hllll, \\
&j_1 \leqslant j_3 \vee j_4 + C, \quad j_2 \geqslant j_3 \geqslant j_5 \ \text{ if } \ (\lambda_k) \in hllll_, \\
&j_1 \leqslant j_3 \vee j_4 + C, \quad j_2 \geqslant j_3, j_4 \geqslant j_5 \ \text{ if } \ (\lambda_k) \in hlll_l_,
\end{aligned}$$

$$j_1 \leqslant j_4, \quad j_3 \leqslant j_5 \leqslant j_4 \ \text{ if } \ (\lambda_k) \in hll_l_l_,$$
$$j_1 \leqslant j_4 + C, \quad j_2 \leqslant j_3 \leqslant j_5 \leqslant j_4 \ \text{ if } \ (\lambda_k) \in hl_l_l_l_.$$

Using the above constraint conditions, we can follow the same ideas as in (Ord1) case to have the estimate

$$|\mathscr{L}_{bcdef}(w)| \lesssim T^{\varepsilon}\|v\|_{Y^0_{p',\Delta}}\|u\|^4_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}, \tag{6.51}$$

where $bcdef \in \{hllll, hllll_, hlll_l_, hll_l_l_, hl_l_l_l_\}$.

Case (Ord2): $\lambda_4 \in h_-$

Case	$\lambda_1 \in$	$\lambda_2 \in$	$\lambda_3 \in$	$\lambda_5 \in$	$\lambda_4 \in$
$llllh_-$	l	l	l	l	h_-
$llll_h_-$	l	l	l	l_-	h_-
$hlll_l_h_-$	l	l	l_-	l_-	h_-
$ll_l_l_h_-$	l	l_-	l_-	l_-	h_-
$l_l_l_l_h_-$	l_-	l_-	l_-	l_-	h_-

Table 9: $\lambda_0 \geqslant \lambda_1 \geqslant \lambda_2 \geqslant \lambda_3 \geqslant \lambda_5 \geqslant \lambda_4$, only one higher frequency in $\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_5$.

As in Table 9, we denote by $(\lambda_k) \in llllh_-$ that $\lambda_0, .., \lambda_5$ satisfy (6.6), (Ord2) and $\lambda_1 \in h$, $\lambda_2, ..., \lambda_5 \in l$. Similarly for the notations $(\lambda_k) \in llll_h_-$,...,$l_l_l_l_h_-$. We consider the decomposition of λ_k:

$$\lambda_4 \in [-\lambda_0, -c\lambda_0] = \bigcup_{j_4 \geqslant 0}(-\lambda_0 + I_{j_4}); \quad \lambda_k \in [0, c\lambda_0] = \bigcup_{j_k \geqslant 0} I_{j_k}, \quad \lambda_l \in [-c\lambda_0, 0] = \bigcup_{j_l \geqslant 0} -I_{j_l}$$

for any $k, l \in \{1, 2, 3, 5\}$. We have the following constraint conditions on $j_1, ..., j_5$:

$$j_4 \leqslant j_1 + C, \ j_1 \geqslant j_2 \geqslant j_3 \geqslant j_5 \ \text{ if } \ (\lambda_k) \in llllh_-,$$
$$j_4 \leqslant j_1 + C, \ j_1 \geqslant j_2 \geqslant j_3, j_5 \leqslant j_1 + C \ \text{ if } \ (\lambda_k) \in llll_h_-,$$
$$j_4 \leqslant j_1 + C, \ j_1 \geqslant j_2, \ j_3 \leqslant j_5 \leqslant j_1 + C \ \text{ if } \ (\lambda_k) \in lll_l_h_-,$$
$$j_4 \leqslant j_1 + C, \ j_2 \leqslant j_3 \leqslant j_5 \leqslant j_1 + C \ \text{ if } \ (\lambda_k) \in ll_l_l_h_-,$$
$$j_4 \leqslant C, \ j_1 \leqslant j_2 \leqslant j_3 \leqslant j_5 \ \text{ if } \ (\lambda_k) \in l_l_l_l_h_-.$$

Using the above constraint conditions, we can follow the same ideas as in (Ord4) case to have the estimate

$$|\mathscr{L}_{bcdef}(w)| \lesssim T^{\varepsilon}\|v\|_{Y^0_{p',\Delta}}\|u\|^4_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}, \tag{6.52}$$

where $bcdef \in \{llllh_-, llll_h_-, lll_l_h_-, ll_l_l_h_-, l_l_l_l_h_-\}$ as in Table 9.

If $\lambda_0, .., \lambda_5$ has the orders as in (Ord3) and only one of them is in higher frequency, then there are two possible cases $\lambda_1 \in h$ and $\lambda_4 \in h_-$, see Tables 10 and 11.

Case (Ord3): $\lambda_1 \in h$

Case	$\lambda_1 \in$	$\lambda_3 \in$	$\lambda_5 \in$	$\lambda_2 \in$	$\lambda_4 \in$
$hllll$	h	l	l	l	l
$hllll_$	h	l	l	l	$l_$
$hlll_l_$	h	l	l	$l_$	$l_$
$hll_l_l_$	h	l	$l_$	$l_$	$l_$
$hl_l_l_l_$	h	$l_$	$l_$	$l_$	$l_$

Table 10: $\lambda_0 \geqslant \lambda_1 \geqslant \lambda_3 \geqslant \lambda_5 \geqslant \lambda_2 \geqslant \lambda_4$, only one higher frequency in $\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_5$.

As in Table 10, we denote by $(\lambda_k) \in hllll$ that $\lambda_0, .., \lambda_5$ satisfy (6.6), (Ord3) and $\lambda_1 \in h$, $\lambda_2, ..., \lambda_5 \in l$. Similarly for the notations $(\lambda_k) \in hllll_$,...,$hl_l_l_l_$. We consider the decomposition of λ_k:

$$\lambda_1 \in [c\lambda_0, \lambda_0] = \bigcup_{j_4 \geqslant 0} (\lambda_0 - I_{j_1}); \quad \lambda_k \in [0, c\lambda_0] = \bigcup_{j_k \geqslant 0} I_{j_k}, \quad \lambda_l \in [-c\lambda_0, 0] = \bigcup_{j_l \geqslant 0} -I_{j_l}$$

for any $k, l \in \{2, 3, 4, 5\}$. We have the following constraint conditions on $j_1, ..., j_5$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&j_1 \leqslant j_3 + C, \quad j_3 \geqslant j_5 \geqslant j_2 \geqslant j_4 \ \text{ if } \ (\lambda_k) \in hllll,\\
&j_1 \leqslant j_3 \vee j_4 + C, \quad j_3 \geqslant j_5 \geqslant j_2 \ \text{ if } \ (\lambda_k) \in hllll_,\\
&j_1 \leqslant j_3 \vee j_4 + C, \quad j_3 \geqslant j_5, j_2 \leqslant j_4 \ \text{ if } \ (\lambda_k) \in hlll_l_,\\
&j_1 \leqslant j_3 \vee j_4, \quad j_5 \leqslant j_2 \leqslant j_4 \ \text{ if } \ (\lambda_k) \in hll_l_l_,\\
&j_1 \leqslant j_4 + C, \quad j_3 \leqslant j_5 \leqslant j_2 \leqslant j_4 \ \text{ if } \ (\lambda_k) \in hl_l_l_l_.
\end{aligned}$$

Using the above constraint conditions, we can follow the same ideas as in (Ord1) case to have the estimate

$$|\mathscr{L}_{bcdef}(w)| \lesssim T^{\varepsilon} \|v\|_{Y^0_{p',\Delta}} \|u\|^4_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}, \tag{6.53}$$

where $bcdef \in \{hllll, hllll_, hlll_l_, hll_l_l_, hl_l_l_l_\}$ in Table 10.

Case (Ord3): $\lambda_4 \in h_$

Case	$\lambda_1 \in$	$\lambda_3 \in$	$\lambda_5 \in$	$\lambda_2 \in$	$\lambda_4 \in$
$llllh_$	l	l	l	l	$h_$
$llll_h_$	l	l	l	$l_$	$h_$
$hlll_l_h_$	l	l	$l_$	$l_$	$h_$
$ll_l_l_h_$	l	$l_$	$l_$	$l_$	$h_$
$l_l_l_l_h_$	$l_$	$l_$	$l_$	$l_$	$h_$

Table 11: $\lambda_0 \geqslant \lambda_1 \geqslant \lambda_3 \geqslant \lambda_5 \geqslant \lambda_2 \geqslant \lambda_4$, only one higher frequency in $\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_5$.

As in Table 11, we denote by $(\lambda_k) \in lllll h_$ that $\lambda_0, .., \lambda_5$ satisfy (6.6), (Ord3) and $\lambda_1 \in h,\ \lambda_2, ..., \lambda_5 \in l$. Similarly for the notations $(\lambda_k) \in lll l_h_$,...,$l_l_l_l_h_$. We consider the decomposition of λ_k:

$$\lambda_4 \in [-\lambda_0, -c\lambda_0] = \bigcup_{j_4 \geqslant 0} (-\lambda_0 + I_{j_4});\quad \lambda_k \in [0, c\lambda_0] = \bigcup_{j_k \geqslant 0} I_{j_k},\quad \lambda_l \in [-c\lambda_0, 0] = \bigcup_{j_l \geqslant 0} -I_{j_l}$$

for any $k, l \in \{1, 2, 3, 5\}$. We have the following constraint conditions on $j_1, ..., j_5$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&j_4 \leqslant j_1 + C,\ j_1 \geqslant j_3 \geqslant j_5 \geqslant j_2 \ \text{ if } \ (\lambda_k) \in lllll h_,\\
&j_4 \leqslant j_1 \vee j_2 + C,\ j_1 \geqslant j_3 \geqslant j_5, \ \text{ if } \ (\lambda_k) \in lll l_h_,\\
&j_4 \leqslant j_1 \vee j_2 + C,\ j_1 \geqslant j_3,\ j_5 \leqslant j_2, \ \text{ if } \ (\lambda_k) \in ll l_l_h_,\\
&j_4 \leqslant j_1 \vee j_2 + C,\ j_3 \leqslant j_5 \leqslant j_2, \ \text{ if } \ (\lambda_k) \in l l_l_l_h_,\\
&j_4 \leqslant j_2 + C,\ j_1 \leqslant j_3 \leqslant j_5 \leqslant j_2 \ \text{ if } \ (\lambda_k) \in l_l_l_l_h_.
\end{aligned}$$

Using the above constraint conditions, we can follow the same ideas as in (Ord4) case to have the estimate

$$|\mathscr{L}_{bcdef}(w)| \lesssim\ T^{\varepsilon} \|v\|_{Y^0_{p',\Delta}} \|u\|^4_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}, \tag{6.54}$$

where $bcdef \in \{lllll h_, lll l_h_, ll l_l_h_, l l_l_l_h_, l_l_l_l_h_\}$ as in Table 11.

If $\lambda_0, .., \lambda_5$ has the orders as in (Ord5) and only one of them is in higher frequency, then two possible cases $\lambda_1 \in h$ and $\lambda_4 \in h_$ will be happened, see Tables 12 and 13.

Case (Ord5): $\lambda_1 \in h$

Case	$\lambda_1 \in$	$\lambda_3 \in$	$\lambda_2 \in$	$\lambda_5 \in$	$\lambda_4 \in$
$hllll$	h	l	l	l	l
$hllll_$	h	l	l	l	$l_$
$hlll_l_$	h	l	l	$l_$	$l_$
$hll_l_l_$	h	l	$l_$	$l_$	$l_$
$hl_l_l_l_$	h	$l_$	$l_$	$l_$	$l_$

Table 12: $\lambda_0 \geqslant \lambda_1 \geqslant \lambda_3 \geqslant \lambda_2 \geqslant \lambda_5 \geqslant \lambda_4$, only one higher frequency in $\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_5$.

As in Table 12, we denote by $(\lambda_k) \in hllll$ that $\lambda_0, .., \lambda_5$ satisfy (6.6), (Ord5) and $\lambda_1 \in h,\ \lambda_2, ..., \lambda_5 \in l$. Similarly for the notations $(\lambda_k) \in hllll_$,...,$hl_l_l_l_$. We consider the decomposition of λ_k:

$$\lambda_1 \in [c\lambda_0, \lambda_0] = \bigcup_{j_4 \geqslant 0} (\lambda_0 - I_{j_1});\quad \lambda_k \in [0, c\lambda_0] = \bigcup_{j_k \geqslant 0} I_{j_k},\quad \lambda_l \in [-c\lambda_0, 0] = \bigcup_{j_l \geqslant 0} -I_{j_l}$$

for any $k, l \in \{2, 3, 4, 5\}$. We have the following constraint conditions on $j_1, ..., j_5$:

$$j_1 \leqslant j_3 + C,\quad j_3 \geqslant j_2 \geqslant j_5 \geqslant j_4 \ \text{ if } \ (\lambda_k) \in hllll,$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&j_1 \leqslant j_3 \vee j_4 + C, \quad j_3 \geqslant j_2 \geqslant j_5 \ \text{ if } \ (\lambda_k) \in \mathit{hllll_},\\
&j_1 \leqslant j_3 \vee j_4 + C, \quad j_3 \geqslant j_2, j_5 \leqslant j_4 \ \text{ if } \ (\lambda_k) \in \mathit{hlll_l_},\\
&j_1 \leqslant j_3 \vee j_4, \quad j_2 \leqslant j_5 \leqslant j_4 \ \text{ if } \ (\lambda_k) \in \mathit{hll_l_l_},\\
&j_1 \leqslant j_4 + C, \quad j_3 \leqslant j_2 \leqslant j_5 \leqslant j_4 \ \text{ if } \ (\lambda_k) \in \mathit{hl_l_l_l_}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Using the above constraint conditions, we can follow the same ideas as in (Ord1) case to have the estimate

$$
|\mathscr{L}_{bcdef}(w)| \lesssim T^{\varepsilon}\|v\|_{Y^0_{p',\Delta}}\|u\|^4_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}, \tag{6.55}
$$

where $bcdef \in \{\mathit{hllll}, \mathit{hllll_}, \mathit{hlll_l_}, \mathit{hll_l_l_}, \mathit{hl_l_l_l_}\}$ in Table 12.

Case (Ord5): $\lambda_4 \in h_$

Case	$\lambda_1 \in$	$\lambda_3 \in$	$\lambda_2 \in$	$\lambda_5 \in$	$\lambda_4 \in$
$\mathit{llllh_}$	l	l	l	l	$h_$
$\mathit{llll_h_}$	l	l	l	$l_$	$h_$
$\mathit{hlll_l_h_}$	l	l	$l_$	$l_$	$h_$
$\mathit{ll_l_l_h_}$	l	$l_$	$l_$	$l_$	$h_$
$\mathit{l_l_l_l_h_}$	$l_$	$l_$	$l_$	$l_$	$h_$

Table 13: $\lambda_0 \geqslant \lambda_1 \geqslant \lambda_3 \geqslant \lambda_2 \geqslant \lambda_5 \geqslant \lambda_4$, only one higher frequency in $\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_5$.

As in Table 13, we denote by $(\lambda_k) \in \mathit{llllh_}$ that $\lambda_0, .., \lambda_5$ satisfy (6.6), (Ord5) and $\lambda_1 \in h$, $\lambda_2, ..., \lambda_5 \in l$. Similarly for the notations $(\lambda_k) \in \mathit{llll_h_}$,...,$\mathit{l_l_l_l_h_}$. We consider the decomposition of λ_k:

$$
\lambda_4 \in [-\lambda_0, -c\lambda_0] = \bigcup_{j_4 \geqslant 0}(-\lambda_0 + I_{j_4}); \quad \lambda_k \in [0, c\lambda_0] = \bigcup_{j_k \geqslant 0} I_{j_k}, \quad \lambda_l \in [-c\lambda_0, 0] = \bigcup_{j_l \geqslant 0} -I_{j_l}
$$

for any $k, l \in \{1, 2, 3, 5\}$. We have the following constraint conditions on $j_1, ..., j_5$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&j_4 \leqslant j_1 + C, \ j_1 \geqslant j_3 \geqslant j_2 \geqslant j_5 \ \text{ if } \ (\lambda_k) \in \mathit{llllh_},\\
&j_4 \leqslant j_1 + C, \ j_1 \geqslant j_3 \geqslant j_2, \ \text{ if } \ (\lambda_k) \in \mathit{llll_h_},\\
&j_4 \leqslant j_1 \vee j_2 + C, \ j_1 \geqslant j_3, \ j_5 \geqslant j_2, \ \text{ if } \ (\lambda_k) \in \mathit{lll_l_h_},\\
&j_4 \leqslant j_1 \vee j_2 + C, \ j_3 \leqslant j_2 \leqslant j_5, \ \text{ if } \ (\lambda_k) \in \mathit{ll_l_l_h_},\\
&j_4 \leqslant j_2 + C, \ j_1 \leqslant j_3 \leqslant j_2 \leqslant j_5, \ \text{ if } \ (\lambda_k) \in \mathit{l_l_l_l_h_}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Using the above constraint conditions, we can follow the same ideas as in (Ord4) case to have the estimate

$$
|\mathscr{L}_{bcdef}(w)| \lesssim T^{\varepsilon}\|v\|_{Y^0_{p',\Delta}}\|u\|^4_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}, \tag{6.56}
$$

where $bcdef \in \{llllh_, llll_h_, lll_l_h_, ll_l_l_h_, l_l_l_l_h_\}$ as in Table 8.

If $\lambda_0, ..., \lambda_5$ satisfy any case of (Ord6)-(Ord10), we easily see that

$$\lambda_0 \geqslant \lambda_1, \quad \lambda_2 \geqslant \lambda_3, \quad \lambda_4 \geqslant \lambda_5.$$

By the frequency constraint condition (H2), one can conclude that

$$\lambda_0 \leqslant \lambda_1 + 20, \quad \lambda_2 \leqslant \lambda_3 + 20, \quad \lambda_4 \leqslant \lambda_5 + 20.$$

Hence, we have

$$\lambda_0 \approx \lambda_1, \quad \lambda_2 \approx \lambda_3, \quad \lambda_4 \approx \lambda_5.$$

We further have for the cases (Ord8) and (Ord10),

$$\lambda_0 \approx \lambda_1 \approx \lambda_2 \approx \lambda_3 \approx \lambda_4 \approx \lambda_5.$$

For the case (Ord7),

$$\lambda_2 \approx \lambda_3 \approx \lambda_4 \approx \lambda_5.$$

For the case (Ord9),

$$\lambda_0 \approx \lambda_1 \approx \lambda_2 \approx \lambda_3.$$

If $\lambda_0 \approx \lambda_1$, the summations on both λ_0 and λ_1 are the summation on λ_0 together with a finite summation on λ_1. So, the proof in the case (Ord6) is easier than that of the case (Ord1). The details of the proof are omitted. Up to now, we have finished the proof of Step 1.

Step 2. We assume that $|\lambda_0|$ is the second largest one in $|\lambda_0|, ..., |\lambda_5|$. We can assume, without loss of generality that $\lambda_0 \gg 1$. There exists $i \in \{1, ..., 5\}$ such that $|\lambda_i| = \max_{0\leqslant k\leqslant 5} |\lambda_k|$. First, we point that this case is quite similar to that of λ_0 to be the largest one as in Step 1. Similar to Lemma 6.2, we have

Lemma 6.3 *Let $0 < c_k < C_k$, $k = 1, 2$. For $w = (\bar{v}, u, \bar{u}, u, \bar{u}, u)$, we write*

$$\mathscr{L}_{2h}(w) = \sum_{\lambda_0>0} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}\times[0,T]} \prod_{k=1}^{2} w^{(k)}_{[c_k\lambda_0, C_k\lambda_0]} \prod_{k=3}^{5} w^{(k)}_{[-C\lambda_0, C\lambda_0]}(x,t)dxdt, \tag{6.57}$$

Let $p \in [4, \infty)$, $0 < T < 1$, $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$. We have

$$|\mathscr{L}_{2h}(w)| \lesssim T^{\varepsilon} \|v\|_{Y^0_{p',\Delta}} \|u\|^5_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}. \tag{6.58}$$

Substituting $w^{(k)}_{[c_k\lambda_0, C_k\lambda_0]}$ by $w^{(k)}_{[-C_k\lambda_0, -c_k\lambda_0]}$ for $k = 1$ or $k = 2$ in (6.57), (6.58) also holds.

The proof of Lemma 6.3 is almost the same as that of Lemma 6.2 and we omit it. If $|\lambda_i|$ is the largest one in $|\lambda_0|, ..., |\lambda_5|$, we have from the frequency constraint condition

$$\lambda_0 \leqslant |\lambda_i| \leqslant 5\lambda_0 + 10 \leqslant 20\lambda_0.$$

By Lemma 6.3 we can assume that $\lambda_k \in [-c\lambda_0, c\lambda_0]$ if $k \in \{1, ..., 5\} \setminus \{i\}$. Namely, it suffice to consider the case that λ_i is higher frequency and the other λ_k $(k \neq i)$ are lower frequency. By symmetry we can further assume that

$$\lambda_2 \geqslant \lambda_4, \quad \lambda_1 \geqslant \lambda_3 \geqslant \lambda_5.$$

Case 1. We consider the case $|\lambda_1| \vee |\lambda_3| \vee |\lambda_5| = \max_{0\leqslant k\leqslant 5} |\lambda_k|$. It follows that $|\lambda_1| \vee |\lambda_5| = \max_{0\leqslant k\leqslant 5} |\lambda_k|$. We further claim that $|\lambda_1| = \max_{0\leqslant k\leqslant 5} |\lambda_k|$. If not, then $-\lambda_5 = \max_{0\leqslant k\leqslant 5} |\lambda_k|$, which contradicts the frequency constraint condition. It is easy to see that $\lambda_1 > 0$. Hence, we have

$$\lambda_1 \geqslant \lambda_0 \geqslant \lambda_k, \quad k = 2, ..., 5.$$

The possible cases are the following

$$\lambda_1 \geqslant \lambda_0 \geqslant \lambda_2 \geqslant \lambda_3 \geqslant \lambda_4 \geqslant \lambda_5, \tag{2Ord1}$$
$$\lambda_1 \geqslant \lambda_0 \geqslant \lambda_2 \geqslant \lambda_3 \geqslant \lambda_5 \geqslant \lambda_4, \tag{2Ord2}$$
$$\lambda_1 \geqslant \lambda_0 \geqslant \lambda_2 \geqslant \lambda_4 \geqslant \lambda_3 \geqslant \lambda_5, \tag{2Ord3}$$
$$\lambda_1 \geqslant \lambda_0 \geqslant \lambda_3 \geqslant \lambda_2 \geqslant \lambda_4 \geqslant \lambda_5, \tag{2Ord4}$$
$$\lambda_1 \geqslant \lambda_0 \geqslant \lambda_3 \geqslant \lambda_2 \geqslant \lambda_5 \geqslant \lambda_4, \tag{2Ord5}$$
$$\lambda_1 \geqslant \lambda_0 \geqslant \lambda_3 \geqslant \lambda_5 \geqslant \lambda_2 \geqslant \lambda_4. \tag{2Ord6}$$

We consider Case (2Ord1). Similar to the Step 1, we have the 5 subcases as in Table 14. As

Case (2Ord1) : λ_1 is maximal

Case	$\lambda_1 \in$	$\lambda_2 \in$	$\lambda_3 \in$	$\lambda_4 \in$	$\lambda_5 \in$
$2hllll$	$[\lambda_0, 20\lambda_0]$	l	l	l	l
$2hllll_$	$[\lambda_0, 20\lambda_0]$	l	l	l	$l_$
$2hlll_l_$	$[\lambda_0, 20\lambda_0]$	l	l	$l_$	$l_$
$2hll_l_l_$	$[\lambda_0, 20\lambda_0]$	l	$l_$	$l_$	$l_$
$2hl_l_l_l_$	$[\lambda_0, 20\lambda_0]$	$l_$	$l_$	$l_$	$l_$

Table 14: $\lambda_1 \geqslant \lambda_0 \geqslant \lambda_2 \geqslant \lambda_3 \geqslant \lambda_4 \geqslant \lambda_5$, only one higher frequency in $\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_5$.

in Table 14, we denote by $(\lambda_k) \in 2hllll$ that $\lambda_0, .., \lambda_5$ satisfy (2Ord1) and $\lambda_1 \in [\lambda_0, 20\lambda_0]$, $\lambda_2, ..., \lambda_5 \in l$. We consider the decomposition of λ_k:

$$\lambda_1 \in [\lambda_0, 20\lambda_0] = \bigcup_{j_1\geqslant 0} (\lambda_0 + I_{j_1}); \quad \lambda_k \in [0, c\lambda_0] = \bigcup_{j_k\geqslant 0} I_{j_k}, \quad k = 2, ..., 5.$$

We have the following constraint conditions on $j_1, ..., j_5$:

$$j_1 \leqslant j_3 + C, \quad j_2 \geqslant j_3 \geqslant j_4 \geqslant j_5.$$

Let us write

$$\mathscr{L}_{2hlll}(w) = \sum_{(\lambda_k)\in 2hlll} \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}\times[0,T]} \prod_{k=0}^{5} w_{\lambda_k}^{(k)}(x,t)dxdt, \tag{6.59}$$

Applying the dyadic decomposition above and Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathscr{L}_{2hlll}(w)| \lesssim \sum_{\lambda_0;\ j_1\leqslant j_2+C;\ j_5\leqslant j_4\leqslant j_3\leqslant j_2} & \langle\lambda_0\rangle^{1/2}\|\overline{v}_{\lambda_0}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t}}\|u_{\lambda_0+I_{j_1}}\|_{L^4_{x,t\in[0,T]}} \\ & \times \|u_{I_{j_3}}\|_{L^4_{x,t\in[0,T]}}\|u_{I_{j_2}}\|_{L^4_{x,t\in[0,T]}}\|u_{I_{j_4}}\|_{L^4_{x,t\in[0,T]}}\|u_{I_{j_5}}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t}}. \end{aligned}\tag{6.60}$$

This estimate reduces to (6.24). Using the same way as in the estimates of (6.24), we have

$$|\mathscr{L}_{2hlll}(w)| \lesssim T^{\varepsilon}\|v\|_{Y^0_{p',\Delta}}\|u\|^5_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}. \tag{6.61}$$

We can use similar way as in Step 1 and case (2Ord1) to handle the cases (2Ord2)-(2Ord6) and we omit the details.

Case 2. $|\lambda_2|\vee|\lambda_4| = \max_{0\leqslant k\leqslant 5}|\lambda_k|$. By Lemma 6.3 we can assume that only one frequency λ_2 or λ_4 is localized in higher frequency intervals $[-20\lambda_0,-\lambda_0]\cup[\lambda_0,20\lambda_0]$. In view of the frequency constraint condition we see that $-\lambda_4 = \max_{0\leqslant k\leqslant 5}|\lambda_k|$ and $\lambda_4\in[-20\lambda_0,-\lambda_0]$. Hence, we have

$$\lambda_0\geqslant\lambda_k\geqslant\lambda_4,\quad k=1,2,3,5.$$

The possible cases are the following

$$\lambda_0\geqslant\lambda_1\geqslant\lambda_2\geqslant\lambda_3\geqslant\lambda_5\geqslant\lambda_4, \tag{3Ord1}$$
$$\lambda_0\geqslant\lambda_1\geqslant\lambda_3\geqslant\lambda_2\geqslant\lambda_5\geqslant\lambda_4, \tag{3Ord2}$$
$$\lambda_0\geqslant\lambda_1\geqslant\lambda_3\geqslant\lambda_5\geqslant\lambda_2\geqslant\lambda_4, \tag{3Ord3}$$
$$\lambda_0\geqslant\lambda_2\geqslant\lambda_1\geqslant\lambda_3\geqslant\lambda_5\geqslant\lambda_4. \tag{3Ord4}$$

For example, we consider the case (3Ord1). As in Table 15, we have 5 subcases These case

Case (3Ord1) : $-\lambda_4$ is maximal

Case	$\lambda_1\in$	$\lambda_2\in$	$\lambda_3\in$	$\lambda_5\in$	$\lambda_4\in$
$3llllh_$	l	l	l	l	$[-20\lambda_0,-\lambda_0]$
$3llll_h_$	l	l	l	$l_$	$[-20\lambda_0,-\lambda_0]$
$3lll_l_h_$	l	l	$l_$	$l_$	$[-20\lambda_0,-\lambda_0]$
$3ll_l_l_h_$	l	$l_$	$l_$	$l_$	$[-20\lambda_0,-\lambda_0]$
$2l_l_l_l_h_$	$l_$	$l_$	$l_$	$l_$	$[-20\lambda_0,-\lambda_0]$

Table 15: $\lambda_0\geqslant\lambda_1\geqslant\lambda_2\geqslant\lambda_3\geqslant\lambda_5\geqslant\lambda_4$, only one higher frequency in $\lambda_1,...,\lambda_5$.

are almost the same as those in Case (Ord2): $\lambda_4 \in h_-$ and we do not perform the details of the proof.

Step 3. We assume that $|\lambda_0|$ is the third largest one in $|\lambda_0|, ..., |\lambda_5|$. We can assume, without loss of generality that $\lambda_0 \geqslant 0$. There exists a rearrangement of $1, ..., 5$, which is denoted by $\pi(1), ..., \pi(5)$ such that

$$|\lambda_{\pi(1)}| \vee |\lambda_{\pi(2)}| \geqslant \lambda_0 \geqslant |\lambda_{\pi(3)}| \vee |\lambda_{\pi(4)}| \vee |\lambda_{\pi(5)}|$$

For $\lambda_{\pi(1)}, \lambda_{\pi(2)}$, we apply the dyadic decomposition starting at $\pm\lambda_0$,

$$\lambda_{\pi(k)} \in [\lambda_0, \infty) = \bigcup_{j_{\pi(k)} \geqslant 0} (\lambda_0 + I_{j_{\pi(k)}}), \quad or \ \lambda_{\pi(k)} \in (-\infty, \lambda_0] = \bigcup_{j_{\pi(k)} \geqslant 0} (-\lambda_0 - I_{j_{\pi(k)}}). \tag{6.62}$$

For $\lambda_{\pi(3)}, \lambda_{\pi(4)}, \lambda_{\pi(5)}$, we adopt the dyadic decomposition starting at 0:

$$\lambda_{\pi(k)} \in [0, \lambda_0] = \bigcup_{j_{\pi(k)} \geqslant 0} I_{j_{\pi(k)}}, \quad or \ \lambda_{\pi(k)} \in [-\lambda_0, 0] = \bigcup_{j_{\pi(k)} \geqslant 0} -I_{j_{\pi(k)}}. \tag{6.63}$$

For example, we consider the following case which is written as $(\lambda_k) \in \mathbb{Z}^6_{+,3}$:

$$\lambda_0 > 0, \quad \lambda_{\pi(1)}, \lambda_{\pi(2)} \in [\lambda_0, \infty), \quad \lambda_{\pi(3)}, \lambda_{\pi(4)}, \lambda_{\pi(5)} \in [0, \lambda_0].$$

Let us write

$$\mathscr{L}^3(w) = \sum_{(\lambda_k) \in \mathbb{Z}^6_{+,3}} \langle \lambda_0 \rangle^{1/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}\times[0,T]} \prod_{k=0}^{5} w^{(k)}_{\lambda_k}(x,t) dxdt, \tag{6.64}$$

Denote $j_{\max} = j_{\pi(3)} \vee j_{\pi(4)} \vee j_{\pi(5)}$, $j_{\min} = j_{\pi(3)} \wedge j_{\pi(4)} \wedge j_{\pi(5)}$, $j_{\mathrm{med}} \in \{j_{\pi(3)}, j_{\pi(4)}, j_{\pi(5)}\} \setminus \{j_{\max}, j_{\min}\}$. Applying Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathscr{L}^3(w)| \lesssim & \sum_{\lambda_0;\ j_{\pi(1)},\ j_{\pi(2)},\ j_{\min}, j_{\mathrm{med}}, j_{\max}} \langle \lambda_0 \rangle^{1/2} \|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t}} \|u_{\lambda_0 + I_{j_{\pi(1)}}}\|_{L^4_{x,t\in[0,T]}} \|u_{\lambda_0 + I_{j_{\pi(2)}}}\|_{L^4_{x,t\in[0,T]}} \\ & \times \|u_{I_{j_{\max}}}\|_{L^4_{x,t\in[0,T]}} \|u_{I_{j_{\mathrm{med}}}}\|_{L^4_{x,t\in[0,T]}} \|u_{I_{j_{\min}}}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t\in[0,T]}} \end{aligned} \tag{6.65}$$

In view of $V^2_\Delta \subset L^\infty_t L^2_x$, $\|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{L^\infty_x} \lesssim \|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{L^2_x}$, by Corollary 3.3 and Lemma 3.2, one has that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathscr{L}^3(w)| \lesssim & T^{4\varepsilon/3} \sum_{\lambda_0;\ j_{\pi(1)},\ j_{\pi(2)},\ j_{\min}, j_{\mathrm{med}}, j_{\max}} \langle \lambda_0 \rangle^{1/2} \|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V^2_\Delta} \langle \lambda_0 + 2^{j_{\pi(1)}} \rangle^{-1/2} \langle \lambda_0 + 2^{j_{\pi(2)}} \rangle^{-1/2} \\ & \times 2^{(j_{\pi(1)} + j_{\pi(2)})(1/4 - 1/p + \varepsilon)} 2^{(j_{\max} + j_{\mathrm{med}})(-1/4 - 1/p + \varepsilon)} 2^{j_{\min}(1/2 - 1/p)} \|u\|^5_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.66}$$

Choosing $0 < \varepsilon \leqslant 1/4p$, and making the summation on $j_{\min}$, j_{med} and $j_{\max}$ in order, one obtain that

$$|\mathscr{L}^3(w)| \lesssim T^{4\varepsilon/3} \sum_{\lambda_0;\ j_{\pi(1)},\ j_{\pi(2)}} \langle \lambda_0 \rangle^{1/2} \|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V^2_\Delta} \langle \lambda_0 + 2^{j_{\pi(1)}} \rangle^{-1/2} \langle \lambda_0 + 2^{j_{\pi(2)}} \rangle^{-1/2}$$

$$\times 2^{(j_{\pi(1)}+j_{\pi(2)})(1/4-1/p+\varepsilon)}\|u\|^5_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}. \tag{6.67}$$

By splitting the summation $\sum_{j_{\pi(1)}}$ into two parts $\sum_{j_{\pi(1)}\leqslant\log_2^{\lambda_0}}$ and $\sum_{j_{\pi(1)}>\log_2^{\lambda_0}}$, one sees that

$$|\mathscr{L}^3(w)| \lesssim T^{4\varepsilon/3}\sum_{\lambda_0}\langle\lambda_0\rangle^{-2/p+2\varepsilon}\|v_{\lambda_0}\|_{V^2_\Delta}\|u\|^5_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}. \tag{6.68}$$

Noticing that $\{\langle\lambda_0\rangle^{-2/p+2\varepsilon}\}\in\ell^p$, by Hölder's inequality we have

$$|\mathscr{L}^3(w)| \lesssim T^{\varepsilon}\|v\|_{Y^0_{p',\Delta}}\|u\|^5_{X^{1/2}_{p,\Delta}}.\ \ (0<\varepsilon\leqslant 1/4p) \tag{6.69}$$

The proof in the above is also adapted to the other cases, say $(\lambda_k)\in\mathbb{Z}^6_{\pm,3}$:

$$\lambda_0>0,\ \ \lambda_{\pi(1)}\in[\lambda_0,\infty),\ \lambda_{\pi(2)}\in(-\infty,-\lambda_0],\ \ \lambda_{\pi(3)}\in[-\lambda_0,0],\ \lambda_{\pi(4)},\lambda_{\pi(5)}\in[0,\lambda_0].$$

Since we did not use the frequency constraint condition, there is no essential difference between the cases $(\lambda_k)\in\mathbb{Z}^6_{+,3}$ and $(\lambda_k)\in\mathbb{Z}^6_{\pm,3}$. We omit the details of the proof for the other cases. When $\lambda_0=0$, the proof is much easier than the case $\lambda_0>0$.

Step 4. We assume that $|\lambda_0|$ is the fourth, or five largest one, or the minimal one in $|\lambda_0|,...,|\lambda_5|$. We can assume, without loss of generality that $\lambda_0\geqslant 0$. Let us consider the case $\lambda_0\gg 1$ be the fourth largest one in $|\lambda_0|,...,|\lambda_5|$. There exists a rearrangement of $1,...,5$, which is denoted by $\pi(1),...,\pi(5)$ such that

$$|\lambda_{\pi(1)}|\vee|\lambda_{\pi(2)}|\vee|\lambda_{\pi(3)}|\geqslant\lambda_0\geqslant|\lambda_{\pi(4)}|\vee|\lambda_{\pi(5)}|$$

For $\lambda_{\pi(1)},...,\lambda_{\pi(3)}$, we apply the dyadic decomposition (6.62) starting at $\pm\lambda_0$. For $\lambda_{\pi(4)},\lambda_{\pi(5)}$, we adopt the dyadic decomposition (6.63) starting at 0. Then we can use a similar way as in Step 3 to obtain the result, as desired. The other cases can be shown along this line. Up to now we have finished the proof of Lemma 6.1.

References

[1] Á. Bényi; K. A. Okoudjou, Local well-posedness of nonlinear dispersive equations on modulation spaces. Bull. Lond. Math. Soc. **41** (2009), 549–558.

[2] Á. Bényi; , K. Gröchenig; K. A. Okoudjou; L. G. Rogers, Unimodular Fourier multipliers for modulation spaces. J. Funct. Anal. **246** (2007), 366–384.

[3] J. Bergh and J. Löfström, Interpolation Spaces, An Introduction, Springer-Verlag, 1976.

[4] H. A. Biagioni and F. Linares, Ill-posedness for the derivative Schrödinger and generalized Benjamin-Ono equations, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **353** (2001), 3649–3659.

[5] J. Bourgain, Fourier transform restriction phenomena for certain lattice subsets and applications to nonlinear evolution equations. I. Schrödinger equations, Geom. Funct. Anal. **3** (1993), no. 2, 107–156.

[6] J. Bourgain, Fourier transform restriction phenomena for certain lattice subsets and applications to nonlinear evolution equations. II. The KdV-equation, Geom. Funct. Anal. **3** (1993), no. 3, 209–262.

[7] J. Chen, D. Fan and L. Sun, Asymptotic estimates for unimodular Fourier multipliers on modulation spaces. Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **32** (2012), 467–485.

[8] E. Cordero and F. Nicola, Metaplectic representation on Wiener amalgam spaces and applications to the Schrödinger equation. J. Funct. Anal. **254** (2008), 506–534.

[9] E. Cordero and F. Nicola, Some new Strichartz estimates for the Schrödinger equation. J. Differential Equations, **245** (2008), 1945–1974.

[10] E. Cordero and F. Nicola, Remarks on Fourier multipliers and applications to the wave equation. J. Math. Anal. Appl., **353** (2009), 583–591.

[11] H. G. Feichtinger, Modulation spaces on locally compact Abelian group, Technical Report, University of Vienna, 1983.

[12] K. Gröchenig, Foundations of Time-Frequency Analysis, Birkhäuser, 2001.

[13] A. Grünrock, An improved local well-posedness result for the modified KdV equation, Int. Math. Res. Not. 2004 (2004), no. 61, 3287–3308.

[14] A. Grünrock, Bi- and trilinear Schrödinger estimates in one space dimension with applications to cubic NLS and DNLS, IMRN, Int. Math. Res. Not. (2005), No. 41, 2525–2558.

[15] S. M. Guo, On the 1D cubic nonlinear Schrödinger equation in an almost critical space, J. Fourier Annl. Appl., to appear.

[16] J.S. Han, B. X. Wang, α-Modulation spaces (I) scaling, embedding and algebraic properties, J. Math. Soc. Japan Vol. **66**, No. 4 (2014) pp. 1315–1373

[17] N. Hayashi, The initial value problem for the derivative nonlinear Schrödinger equation in the energy space. Nonlinear Anal., **20** (1993), 823–833.

[18] N. Hayashi and T. Ozawa, Finite energy solutions of nonlinear Schrödinger equations of derivative type, SIAM J. Math. Anal., **25** (1994), 1488–1503.

[19] N. Hayashi, T. Ozawa, Remarks on nonlinear Schrödinger equations in one space dimension, Differential Integral Equations **7** (1994), 453–461.

[20] M. Hadac, S. Herr and H. Koch, Well-posedness and scattering for the KP-II equation in a critical space. Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire **26** (2009), 917-941.

[21] T. Iwabuchi, Navier-Stokes equations and nonlinear heat equations in modulation spaces with negative derivative indices. J. Differential Equations, **248** (2010), 1972–2002.

[22] F. John, Plane Waves and Spherical Means. Applied to partial differential equations, Springer, 1981.

[23] K. Kato, M. Kobayashi and S. Ito, Representation on Schrödinger operator of a free partical via short time Fourier transform and its applications. Tohoku Math. J., **64** (2012), 223–231.

[24] K. Kato, M. Kobayashi and S. Ito, Estimates on modulation spaces for Schrödinger evolution operators with quadratic and sub-quadratic potentials. J. Funct. Anal., **266** (2014), 733–753.

[25] T. Kato, The global Cauchy problems for the nonlinear dispersive equations on modulation spaces. J. Math. Anal. Appl. **413** (2014), 821–840.

[26] H. Koch and D. Tataru, Dispersive estimates for principlally normal pseudo-differential operators, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **58** (2005), 217–284.

[27] H. Koch and D. Tataru, A priori bounds for the 1D cubic NLS in negative Sobolev spaces,Int. Math. Res. Not., 2007, no. 16, Art. ID rnm053, 36 pp.

[28] H. Koch and D. Tataru, Energy and local energy bounds for the 1D cubic NLS equation in $H^{1/4}$, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire 29 (2012), 955–988.

[29] T. Ozawa, Y. Tsutsumi, Space-time estimates for null gauge forms and nonlinear Schrödinger equations. Differential Integral Equations **11** (1998), 201–222.

[30] M. Sugimoto and N. Tomita, The dilation property of modulation spaces and their inclusion relation with Besov spaces, J. Funct. Anal., **248** (2007), 79–106.

[31] H. Takaoka, Well-posedness for the one-dimensional nonlinear Schrödinger equationwith the derivative nonlinearity, Adv. Differential Equations, **4** (1999), 561–580. [15]

[32] H. Tribel, Theory of Function Spaces, Birkhäuser-Verlag, 1983.

[33] J. Toft, Continuity properties for modulation spaces, with applications to pseudo-differential calculus, I. J. Funct. Anal., **207** (2004), 399–429.

[34] B.X. Wang, Globally well and ill posedness for non-elliptic derivative Schrödinger equations with small rough data, J. Funct. Anal., **265** (2013), 3009–3052.

[35] B. X. Wang, L. J. Han and C. Y. Huang, Global Smooth Effects and Well-Posedness for the Derivative Nonlinear Schrödinger Equaton with Small Rough Data, Ann. Inst H. Poincare, AN, **26** (2009), 2253–2281.

[36] B. X. Wang and C. Y. Huang, Frequency-uniform decomposition method for the generalized BO, KdV and NLS equations, J. Diff. Eqns., **239** (2007), 213–250.

[37] B. X. Wang, Z. H. Huo, C. C. Hao and Z. H. Guo, Harmonic Analysis Method for Nonlinear Evolution Equations. I. World Scientific Publishing Co., Pte. Ltd., Hackensack, NJ (2011).

[38] B. X. Wang and H. Hudzik, The global Cauchy problem for the NLS and NLKG with small rough data, J. Diff. Eqns., **232** (2007) 36-73.

[39] B. X. Wang , L. F. Zhao and B. L. Guo, Isometric decomposition operators, function spaces $E^{\lambda}_{p,q}$ and applications to nonlinear evolution operators, J. Funct. Anal., **233** (2006) 1–39.